





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

THE HISTORICAL RELATION
OF
NEW ENGLAND
TO THE
ENGLISH COMMONWEALTH.

BY
JOHN WINGATE THORNTON.

1874.

PRESS OF
ALFRED MUDGE & SON, BOSTON, U. S. A.

Privatz.

RBR
Jantz
#885

THE HISTORICAL RELATION OF NEW ENGLAND

TO THE ENGLISH COMMONWEALTH.

“Look now at American Saxondom ; and at that little Fact of the sailing of the Mayflower, two hundred years ago, from Delft Haven, in Holland ! Werè we of open sense, as the Greeks were, we had found a Poem here,—one of Nature’s own Poems, such as she writes in broad facts over great continents. For it was properly the beginning of America : there were straggling settlers in America before, some material as of a body was there, but the soul of it was first this.”—*The Hero as Priest*, Carlyle, 1840.

“In y^e name of God, Amen. We, whose names are underwritten, . . . having undertaken for y^e glorie of God, and advancement of y^e Christian faith, and honour of our king & countrie, a voyage to plant y^e first colonie in y^e northern parts of Virginia, doe by these presents, solemnly & mutually, in y^e presence of God and one another, covenant & combine ourselves together into a civill body politick, . . . and by vertue hearof, to enacte, constitute, and frame such just & equall lawes, ordinances, acts, constitutions, & offices, from time to time, as shall be thought most meete & convenient for y^e generall good of y^e colonie, unto which we promise all due submission and obedience.” Cape Cod, Nov. $\frac{1}{21}$, 1620. — *Pilgrim Constitutional Convention*.

“The event is without parallel in the history of any country. . . . It placed on Massachusetts that mental stamp which is destined to prevail over the whole of North America, and to affect the order of events in the old world.” — *Senate Doc. Massachusetts*, 1852, Charles C. Hazewell.

“Rev. John Cotton, . . . minister of Boston, in Lincolnshire, carried the name across the Ocean with him ; fixed it upon a new small Home he had found there,—which has become a large one since ; the big busy Capital of Massachusetts, *Boston*, so called. *John Cotton, his mark*, ver’y curiously stamped on the face of this Planet ; likely to continue for some time ! . . . Oracular of high Gospels to New [and Old] England ; who, in his day, was well seen to be connected with the Supreme Powers of this Universe, the word of him being as a live-coal to the hearts of many. . . . In fact, there are traceable various small threads of relation, *interesting reciprocities and mutualities*, connecting the poor young Infant New England with its old Puritan Mother, and her affairs, in those years. *Which ought to be disentangled, to be made conspicuous and beautiful*, by the Infant her-

self, now that she is grown big ; the busy old Mother having had to shove them with so much else of the like, hastily out of the way for the present ! . . . It is in congratulation on the late high Actings, and glorious Appearances of Providence in Old England, that Cotton has been addressing Oliver." 28 July, Oct. 2, 1651. — *CLXXXIV of Cromwell's Letters, etc.*, Carlyle, 1845.

" It had been happy for England that Master Cotton had taken longer time for deliberation." *Dissuasive from the Errors of the Time*, 1645 : 56, 59, 60, by Robert Baillie, Scottish Commissioner to the Westminster Assembly.

A FREQUENT recurrence to the fundamental principles of our polity is enjoined upon us as absolutely necessary to preserve the advantages of liberty and to maintain a free government. The most natural course of this study is in the historical development of our institutions, tracing their germinal ideas in the old-world conflicts. On the discovery of America it was at once mixed up with the religious and political struggles of Europe. Thus, duly considered, the profusion of Leo X and King James's dissatisfaction with his shabby palace are historical keys to fundamental principles in American organic law. So our own George Downing's suggestion of specific parliamentary appropriations, adopted by Charles II against the advice of his whole council, and ending the centuries of dispute between Crown and Commons, may be claimed as an American idea. So, — in the roadstead of what is now Provincetown Harbor,¹ the scene of the Landing of the Pilgrims in New England, and our historical and political beginning, — the cabin of the solitary May Flower, witnessed the pivotal event of modern political history, the compact of November $\frac{1}{2}$ 1, 1620. This — the first written constitution of popular government originated by the people, the germ of American institutions, civil and religious — marks no less a crisis in the world's history, forcibly illustrating Mr. Guizot's remark, that "great ideas, great men, and great events cannot be measured by the magnitude of their cradles."

Riding rough November seas, two hundred and fifty years gone by, this strained and weather-beaten ship, freighted with

¹ Bradford's *Hist. of Plymouth*, p. 89. Dexter's *Mourt's Relation*, 3-8. Baylies's *Hist. of New Plymouth*, i, 27. Freeman's *Hist. of Cape Cod*, i, 60.

Christian families, — greater than the kings and heroes of the Argo, — hovered on this desolate coast, waiting till the dawn for anchorage in less tempestuous waters within Gosnold's Cape Cod.¹ No imaginary ills could have urged to so desperate a venture, with wives and children, across a wintry ocean, "to seek out a habitation" in a strange and houseless wilderness, the lair of savages and wild beasts. Who were these refugees? From what wrongs were they escaping? In what school of adversity had they found the polity that has furnished the precedent for a continent, if not for the world?

These are the questions which invite a review of the political and ecclesiastical events and their historical interdependence, which culminated in 1620 on the shores of New England, hallowing the Pilgrims' land to all times as the cradle of civil and religious liberty. The present research touches mainly the development of principles, and calls for historical incidents only as they illustrate the spirit of progress and the inertia or hostility of conservatism.

As dissenters, their offences were rather of omission than of action; so that inquiry as to the occasions and reasons of dissent is of necessity in the nature of an indictment, the Protestants being complainants; and my duty is to present their cause and the evidence of record.

Rome, Geneva, and Canterbury each claimed authority *jure divino*; in each heresy and sedition were one; each kindled the green fagots of persecution, and in bigotry and intolerance² they were akin.

The reformers and their precursors, Waldo, Wicliffe, and Huss, were like skirmishers on the enemies' frontiers, engaged in light combats, at a distance from each other; but the first to organize hostilities against Rome, the first general in the field to combine the forces in aggressive and systematic war, was JOHN CALVIN. Rome never felt a deadlier wound than that inflicted by Calvin's policy of quick and thorough destruction of its ecclesiastical pageantry, imagery, and symbolism.³

¹ Bradford, pp. 77, 78.

² "Toleration — that intolerable term of insult to all who love liberty." — Motley's *United Netherlands*, iv, 547.

³ "Where images were left there was most contest, but most peace where they were all sheer pulled down, as they were in some places." Strype in *Hallam's*

It proposed a revolution, sharp and decisive, rather than a halting, lingering reformation like that in England. The pulpit and the Bible in the vernacular superseded the altar with its priestly mediation and anathema, oblations and idols, clouds of incense and glitter of ornament,¹ gorgeous vestments, punctilious ceremonies and drawling of dead words.² Luther burnt the Pope's bull, but Calvin's *Institutes* razed the tiara and returned the "keys" to the people, theirs by inheritance, though lost in the long night of mediæval and antichristian darkness. Where Calvin's polity banished the mitre and its livery of sacerdotalism, — what John Knox irreverently called its "laughable fooleries and comical dresses," — men were roused from mental torpor, led to think, to consider, — the preliminary of education and progress, — and so rose to a simpler and higher reverence, to a "worship in spirit and in truth." The pall of Popery was torn, and light shone through the rents; superstition crumbled, with its ritual and mechanism; the inward chains fixed on the soul gradually gave way before the light of inquiry; communities were weaned from mediæval fiction and heathenish ceremonies; and the ecclesiastical merchandise of holy water, old bones, and indulgences, of specifics, observances, and other sacerdotal nostrums, excited only aversion and contempt. Wordsworth celebrates

— "those godly men
Who swept from Scotland, in a flame of zeal,
Shrine, altar, image, and the massy piles
That harbored them . . .
In deadly scorn of superstitious rites."

"The Reformation was," says Mr. Carlyle, "a return to Truth and Reality in opposition to Falsehood and Semblance."

England, i, 86. "Ye ceremonies and servis booke and other Popish and anti-christian stuff, the plague of England to this day," said our Governor Bradford in 1630. "Not daring to eke out what was defective in our light, in matters divine, with human prudence, — the fatal error to reformation, — lest by sewing any piece of the 'old garment' unto the 'new,' we should make the 'rent' worse." — *An Apologetical Narration to Parliament*, by Goodwin, Nye, *et al.*, 1643.

¹ The vestments "led to erroneous notions among the people, and kept alive a recollection of former superstitions, which render their return to them more easy in the event of another political revolution." Hallam, i, 175.

² "The mysteriousness of an unknown dialect served to impose on the vulgar, and to throw an air of wisdom around the priesthood." Hallam's *England*, 1866, i, 86.

Lord Bacon, in his *Controversies of the Church*, 1589, says: "They have made it in a manner of the essence of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper to have a sermon precedent. They have, in a sort, annihilated the use of liturgies and divine service."

The travelled observer, Sir Edwin Sandys, son of the archbishop, a man pleasantly associated with the Pilgrim Fathers, and whose books had the honor to be burned in Paul's Churchyard, by order of the High Commission, in 1605, records in his *Europæ Speculum*, 1599,¹ that "the first and chiefe meanes, whereby the Reformers of Religion did prevaile in all places, was . . . preaching, . . . at that time . . . out of use, . . . the French Protestants making it an essentiall and chiefe part of the service of God; whereas the Romanists make the masse only a work of duty, and the going to a sermon but a matter of convenience."

Hugh Latimer, the martyr, "continued all King Edward's time, preaching for the most part every Sunday two sermons, to the great shame, confusion, and damnation of a great number of our fat-bellied, unpreaching prelates." In his "notable sermon at Paul's Church in London," January 8, 1548, Latimer said, "The preaching of the word of God unto the people is called meat,—Scripture calleth it meat. Not strawberries, that come but once a year, and tarry not long, but are soon gone, but it is meat. It is no dainties. The people must have meat that must be familiar and continuall, and daily given unto them to feed upon. Many make a strawberry of it, ministering but once a year; but such do not the office of good prelates. . . . How many such prelates, how many such bishops . . . are there now in England? . . . O Lord, whither shall we flee from them? . . . We have had so many hundred years, so many unpreaching prelates, lording loyterers and idle ministers. . . . The apostles . . . preached and lorded not. And now they lord and preach not, . . . there is no work done, the people starve." In his "Brief Discourse" of 1581, George Gifforde says, "I know that in our land, let al the people be numbered, and five parts of yee doe not understand so much in the commandements, Lord's prayer, and articles of the faith, that it

¹ Sandys' *Europæ Speculum*, p. 76.

were a greate shame for a godly man to have a child of X years olde for to know no more." ¹ In their abject ignorance and superstition, the people had been like "dumb driven cattle."

It was like the quiet of paralysis, except as now and then the moral waste was illumined by the bonfire of a Wicliffe's plea for conscience, or of a Tyndale's *English New Testament*, or the burning of a Huss flashed through the darkness to make a Luther, a Calvin, or a Knox. As Cardinal Pole's fagots bathed Ridley and Latimer in fire, at Oxford, Oct. 16, 1555, "Be of good comfort, maister Ridley, and play the man," said Latimer: "we shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in England as shall never be put out."

In the time of Henry VIII, probably nineteen twentieths of the people, blind, wretched, and of too little intelligence to be other than indifferent to the strife of the thoughtful few, — the innovators and agitators, — were obsequious to authority if wrapped in the old familiar badges of superstition and consecrated by custom. The murky ignorance slowly yielding to the Gospel light kindled at Lutterworth is hinted by Shakespeare's Jack Cade,² the rebel, not a century before Queen Elizabeth was born: "Thou hast most traitorously corrupted the youth of the realm, in erecting a grammar-school; and whereas, before, our fore-fathers had no other books but the score and the tally, thou hast caused printing to be used; and, contrary to the King, his crown and dignity, thou hast built a paper-mill. It will be proved to thy face, that thou hast men about thee that usually talk of a noun and a verb, and such abominable words as no Christian ear can endure to hear."

To which Lord Say answered, like a true disciple of Wicliffe, — "Ignorance is the curse of God; knowledge, the wing wherewith we fly to Heaven," — the very opposite of the thesis that "Ignorance is the mother of Piety."³

"When want of learning kept the layman low,
And none but priests were authorized to know;

¹ London, 1581, p. 43.

² *Henry VI*, 2d pt., act iv, sc. 7.

³ "Catholike Priests, who had borne the common sort in hand, that Ignorance was the mother of Devotion, and such ignorant Devotion was the way of Salvation." "The Pouring out of the Seven Vials," etc., by John Cotton, 1642, p. 5. See also "*Jewell's Works*, Parker Society's Ed., 799, 800, 1203. Pilkinton, Parker Soc., 611.

When what small knowledge was in them did dwell,
 And he a God who could but read or spell ;
 Then Mother Church did mightily prevail ;
 She parcelled out the Bible by retail,
 But still expounded what she sold or gave,
 To keep it in her power to damn and save.
 Scripture was scarce, and, as the market went,
 Poor laymen took salvation on content,
 As needy men take money, good or bad ;
 God's word they had not, but the priests' they had.

At last, a knowing age began to inquire
 If they the Book or that did them inspire ;
 And making narrower search they found, though late,
 That what they thought the priests' was their estate."¹

Henry VIII — moved, it matters not here whether by personal or political cause, whether vexed by passion, anxiety for the succession, or the farce of papal scruples — cut the knot by putting his own name in place of the Pope's, declaring his own supremacy, and that he no longer held England in vassalage to Rome ; and, as Roger Williams² said, " With consent and act of Parliament, sate downe himselfe in the Pope's chaire in *England* as since his successors have done," while the pliant " bishops who, though they had renounced the pope, still hugged the popedom, and shared the authority among themselves, by their six bloody articles persecuting the protestants no slacker than the pope would have done."³

" The scheme was merely," says Macaulay,⁴ " to rob the Babylonian enchantress of her ornaments, to transfer the full cup of her sorceries to other hands, spilling as little as possible by the way. The [Roman] Catholic rites and doctrines were to be retained in the Church of England."

The head of the church, though no longer a foreigner, but an Englishman, was still the " Defender of the Faith," with the old hierarchal argument of sword and fagot, burning the English New Testament,—that Pandora's box to absolutism, caste, and privilege, whether in church or state,—and strangling its

¹ Dryden's *Religio Laici*, 16.

² *Queries*, 1644, in Publications of the Narragansett Club, ii, 259.

³ Milton *Of the Reformation in England*, 1641. Bohn's Ed., ii, 370.

⁴ Macaulay's *Review of Hallam*.

translator, Tyndale, 1536, whose dying prayer was, "Lord, open the eyes of the King of England!"

The king's eyes were not opened, and as for centuries past, so for centuries to come, the obscure and despised few were to be the forlorn hope of Christian liberty, of human rights. The cathedral, the trappings and pomp of prelacy and its sensuous worship, were retained, and the old rookeries which Tyndale described as "seats and nests for all unclean birds, and for blind owls which hawk in the dark, and dare not come into the light," — these were preserved, ever inviting Rome to its ancient abodes. The "mother" ever regarded the new incumbents as apostates and ecclesiastical poachers,— a cheat in her livery, to be routed from their fat possessions.

"Panting and pensive now she ranged alone,
And wandered in the kingdoms once her own."¹

The retention of Rome's prelatic polity, ritual, and phraseology in the Prayer Book embarrassed the reformers at every step, and embroiled them in endless jangling, all of which the far-seeing statesmanship of Calvin swept away like cobwebs. Tyndale said in 1530, "The root you left behind, whence all that they have for a time weeded out will spring again by little and little as before: if they, as their hope is, may stop this light of God's word that is abroad." It was this danger, when Mary ordered a mass in Holyrood, August, 1561, that made John Knox to exclaim from the pulpit, "that one mass was more fearfull unto him, than if ten thousand armed enemies were landed in any part of the realme, of purpose to suppress the hole religion."²

Indeed, the reformation of the Anglo-Catholic Church was so imperfect that to be Romish under Mary, or Anglican under Elizabeth, or either under James, involved so little outward change that after the performances in the royal chapel at the Feast of St. Michael, 1606, the Duke of Lorraine said,³ "I do not see what should hinder the churches of Rome and England to unite. There is nothing of the Mass wanting here but the

¹ Dryden.

² McCrie's *Knox*, Bohn's Ed. 1847, 192. Froude's *Short Studies*, 1871, 139.

³ McCrie's *Mellville*, Ed. 1856, pp. 252-263.

adoration of the Host." So when, at the suggestion of Laud,¹ James I sent his son Charles to Spain in 1623, to secure the Spanish alliance, he ordered two of his chaplains to join the embassy, and "to take with them their dress, caps, surplices, chalices, ornaments, . . . to show by these external forms how little . . . is the difference between them and the Roman Church." Think of the "Governor" of the Anglo-Catholic Church sending its clergy and insignia to "His Most Catholic Majesty of Spain," as living witnesses and visible proof of its loving approach to papal orthodoxy in ritual and symbol, and its pliancy upon occasion. Ten years later the same Laud, chief instigator of the vindictive and remorseless persecution of good Protestants, — the founders of New England, — and the denouncer of the "dissenting" ministers as "the people's creatures,"² entered in his diary,³ August 4, 1633: "There came to me (one) that vowed ability to perform it and offered me to be a cardinal." It was not resented as an insult, but taken into deliberate consideration, for eleven days later he again wrote: "I had a serious offer made me to be a cardinal. I was then absent from the court, but as soon as I came hither

¹ Prynne's *Canterburie's Doom*.

² "The people's creatures." This priestly contempt for "the people" also distinguished their "missionaries" to "heathen" America, especially in New England and New Jersey. These manipulating "successors" of the Apostles, with diminished heads, flouted at the Mayhews, the Chaunceys, the Edwards and Hopkins, Witherspoons and Burrs, the glory of the American churches, as "dissenters" . . . of ye leather mitten ordination . . . given by ye mob," the people; and to them the "Canons of Congress" in defence of Liberty and Independence were against "the Canons of the Church." Then they "omitted prayers" for the American cause, as again in 1862 they voted not to pray for "our National Government" in our life-struggle against slavery. After the war was over the National Convention of the Episcopal Church refused to adopt a resolution expressive of "thanks to Almighty God for the triumph of the National Government and for the removal of the great cause of our national [alienation]." — *The Episcopal Church in the American Colonies*. Clark's *History of St. John's Church, Elizabethtown, New Jersey*, 1871, 83, 84, 110-113, 169. *Reports of General Episcopal Conventions*, 1862, 1868.

³ Hallam says: "The new primate made a strange answer to the first application, which might well encourage a second; certainly not what might have been expected from a steady Protestant. If we did not read this in his own diary we should not believe it. The offer at least proves that he was supposed capable of accepting it." "To think well of the reformed religion is enough to make the Archbishop an enemy." — Hallam's *Const. Hist. of England*, Ed. 1855, ii, ch. viii, pp. 58-65.

. . . I acquainted his Majesty with it ; but my answer was that somewhat dealt within me which would not suffer that, till Rome was other than it was." Within one month that king "translated" that prelate to the primacy of the Anglo-Catholic Church. Under this influence the Star Chamber forbade all publication¹ of Protestant books, such as *Fox's Book of Martyrs*, *Luther's Table Talk*, and the *Willett's Exposures of Popery*, and in 1634² prohibited the escape to New England of "persons ill-affected to the religion established in the Church of England . . . of ministers who are inconformable to the ceremonies and discipline of the church," and "all that had already gone forth . . . forthwith to be remanded back." They were "vexed at home and not suffered to seek peace abroad." Milton affirmed that the prelates openly "cherish and side with the Papists, and are, as it were, one party with them." The church canons declared that "the most high and sacred order of Kings is of divine right" ; that there is no limit to the money "due to Kings from their subjects by the law of God," and that if any resist, according to St. Paul, "they shall receive to themselves damnation" ! They also threaten excommunication to "a sect of factious people, sprung up among us, despisers and depravers of the 'Book of Common Prayer,' who will hear sermons, and will not say prayers according to Act of Parliament. Such were the conspirators, such the treason against God and man, such the falsehood, which "a sect of factious people," the loyal Christian manhood of England, resisted even unto death.

When they asked, "What is the Anglo-Catholic faith?" the answer came in the ever-varying acts of Parliament, dogmas, canons, and punctilios under the Tudors or the Stuarts, successively enforced under pains and penalties.³ Such vibrations might not disturb a Vicar of Bray.

The Puritan ever appealed to Scripture, and paid for his dissent and loyalty to conscience in dungeons, at the stake, on the gibbet, or in exile if happily he could escape, thus slowly finding out the right of private judgment, of individual con-

¹ Davids' *Nonconformity in Essex*, 1863, p. 181.

² *N. E. Historic. and Genl. Reg.*, viii, 135.

³ Sydney Smith's "Persecuting Bishops," *Ed. Rev.*, 1822.

science, — the corner-stone of the temple of liberty. A "Come now, let us reason together" would have lowered the dignity of these prelates. Six feet by two, a felon's grave, was the response of Force to Reason. The Independent John Locke said it is for government "to stamp silver and gold, and thereby make them current money; yet every man has the liberty to examine even those very pieces . . . the stamp makes it neither good nor current. But . . . to coin opinions into truths, and make them current by their authority . . . because this governor or that priest says they are so,"¹ is monstrous.

Selden's famous syllogism was conclusive: Whether "the convocation, which is questionable, whether *jure divino*, and parliaments, which out of question are not *jure divino*, should meddle with religion, which is *jure divino*, I leave to you, Mr. Speaker!"

The murderers of Sir Henry Vane said, "We do not know how to answer him, but we do know what to do with him."

The questions of Sir Walter Raleigh in the House of Commons in 1592 — "If two or three thousand Brownists meet at the sea-side, at whose charge shall they be transported? or whither will you send them? I am sorry for it, but I am afraid there is near twenty thousand of them in England; and when they are gone, who shall maintain their wives and children?" — were answered by the act of 1593, of indiscriminate banishment. Some of them "resolved," says Governor Bradford, in his lately discovered journal,² "to go into the Low Countries, where they heard was freedom of opinion for all men," free from "ye ceremonies and servis booke, and other popish and anti-Christian stuff, the plague of England to this day . . . which ye better part sought, according to ye puritie of ye Gospel, to route out and utterly to abandon." There, one of the congregations of exiles chartered the "MAY FLOWER"; but their pastor, the venerable Robinson, with a part of his flock, was hindered from

¹ King's *Life of Locke*, Bohn's Ed., p. 347.

² As to my discovery of the Bradford manuscript; and its appropriation by Rev. John S. Barry and Mr. Charles Deane, *par nobile fratrum*, see Barry's *History of Massachusetts*, i, 79³, Bradford's *History of Plymouth*, p. v, and *New Englands Historical and Genealogical Register*, 1855: 231. 1856: 353.

coming to Plymouth by the intolerance of the party, which, as we shall see, soon after began the second colony — Massachusetts. Such was the malice of bigotry against good men of exemplary life and conversation.

In a letter to the judicious Hooker by George Cranmer, one of his ablest disciples, 1598, he says, "If the positions of the Reformers be true, I cannot see how the main and general conclusions of Brownism should be false; for upon these two points, as I conceive, they stand: 1st." . . . their right "to sever themselves from us. 2d. That without civil authority they are to erect a church of their own."¹

What must have been the popular intelligence and virtue where such principles could be considered dangerous, and what the character and policy of rulers in church and state who trembled at their utterance! How luminous the wisdom, how grand the spirit of those who came out of that darkness, with loss of all things but conscience, in literal obedience to the apostolic injunction, "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled *again*."

"Assuredly," says Macaulay, "if there be any class of men whom the Protestant non-conformists of England respect more highly than another, if any whose memory they hold in deeper veneration, it is that class of men, of high spirit and unconquerable principles, who, in the days of Archbishop Laud, preferred leaving their native country and living in the 'savage solitudes of a wilderness,' rather than to live in a land of prosperity and plenty, where they could not enjoy the privilege of worshipping their Maker freely, according to the dictates of their conscience."

The virtual transfer of the tiara to Henry VIII was in principle, as it became in fact, revolutionary; for with it the fundamental idea of apostolic succession logically went to the winds, and with it, its authority; but it also wrought a nobler gain, for it changed the field of contest, and evoked the spirit of patriotism, the love and pride of country. Besides, to talk of Anglo-Catholicism was no more absurd than of Roman-Catholicism. The genius of the Roman, Anglican, Scottish, or of any hierarchy, is essentially military; it insists upon unity and consol-

¹ *Appendix to Walton's Life of Richard Hooker.*

idation, at whatever cost of private judgment or of personal conscience. It weaves a net-work of centralization which stifles freedom of thought, and establishes the most odious of all despotisms, that over the mind ; it is necessarily hostile to individualism and self-government ; it must regard democracy as incompatible with its own prosperity, because subversive of that unreasoning subordination, that implicit obedience, which is its only security.

"If you look upon the government of churches," says Mr. John Cotton,¹ "you will find little difference between Episcopacy and Popery, for they are governed by Popish canons" ; and if parliaments are as the times, we may know that it was the poor, especially, who welcomed the Gospel, for both Houses tendered to Henry VIII a bill taking the reading of the Scriptures from most of the laity. Very tedious were the steps leading England to emancipation from Roman thralldom. The cutting loose from Rome involved the loss of her assumed authority ; for the *Sacerdos*, if divine, is a unit, incompatible with any other authority. It was this essential defect, coupled with the likeness of Canterbury to the Vatican, which gave the sting to the taunt of Milton, who, in his abhorrence of hierarchal arrogance, intolerance, and cruelty, called the new Church "the bastard daughter of Rome." For, still calling itself "the" church, and claiming the old monopoly as the exclusive depository and medium of divine truth and grace, it must be intolerant of doubt or dissent, and so the rights of manhood — of conscience, of thought, and of private judgment — were again to be fought as vehemently and cruelly by the Anglo-Catholic as they ever had been by the Roman Catholic Church, and to be enforced by the same arguments, by personal suffering. In blind fear and hatred of liberty, in intolerance, they were one. Bigotry is cruel, — the defect is inherent in the system. "Like mother, like daughter," was the Puritan proverb. The very existence of an established church was a monstrous injustice.

The intestinal griefs in the Church of England became in young Edward's time a sort of old-clothes quarrel, "a surplice brabble, a tippet scuffle," — ludicrous enough, but for the fearful sufferings to the Reformers ; yet it involved the integral

¹ *Churches' Resurrection*, 1642, p. 19.

principle of the whole system — *authority*. Hooper, the first Puritan in the Church of England, refused the proffered See of Gloucester, in 1551, if obliged to wear the superstitious vestments of Rome, and preferred a prison with conscience to being “twice a saint in lawn” without it. The Puritan alleged Scripture and reason: the hierarch urged the inventions of councils, authority, precedent, and prudence,—the usual arguments of the strong and the timid; the Puritan stood for principle, the hierarch consulted expediency; the Puritan rested on right, the hierarch on usage and policy; the one pleaded the principles of justice, the other reasons of state. And so it was when “Bloody Mary” assumed the crown,—a part of the Church of England was burned at Smithfield, a very large part sank sleepily into the “bosom of Rome,” while still another portion found a more natural and congenial refuge in the reformed portions of the Continent, especially in the Low Countries.

Among these a “little congregation” found a generous shelter at Frankfort-on-the-Main. In that hospitable city in a “strange land,” free from the thrall of despotic authority, and thrown upon their natural rights, self-government was the spontaneous outgrowth of the situation. They tasted the sweets of liberty. “What greater treasure,” they wrote, in 1554, “or sweeter comfort could be desired by a Christian man than to have a church wherein he may serve God in purity of faith and integrity of life. . . . Where we would, we could not there obtain it. . . . Before, we have reasoned together in hope to obtain a church . . . free from all dregs of superstitious ceremonies, . . . we had fully determined to have our church served by ministers of our own choosing, and of equal authority. We do not wish a chief superintendent (or bishop), and should we, he would be elected by ourselves.”¹

The congregation by common consent used the order of worship of the church of Geneva, of which Calvin was pastor, . . . as most godly, and farthest off from superstition.” So naturally did the principle and practice of independency, a self-organized, self-governing congregation, assert itself, with the Bible as its guide and Reason as its interpreter. Seventy years later the principle will reassert itself, under more favora-

¹ Hopkins's *Puritans and Queen Elizabeth*, i, pp. 76-88.

ble conditions, and give the law to a continent, for under it and in it to-day we live and move and have our being ; it is the fundamental idea of free government and is the glory of our Constitution. John Knox, in his forty-eighth year, then at Geneva, accepted their call to preach to them "the most lively Word of God," and arrived at Frankfort the next November 6.

There were joy and concord in that "little congregation" till a company of other English refugees, intent on profound matters of church forms and ceremonies, mere incendiaries, who got admission under pretence of brotherly love, broke up the congregation. "The troubles at Frankfort" under the lead of the graceless bigot, Dr. Cox, were remembered by Knox and not forgotten by the Puritans.

Others of the Marian exiles, unbiassed by the presence or influence of an established system, or state religion, were led by a study of the Scriptures to question the superiority of bishops, were alienated from Episcopacy, and strongly inclined to the more popular Genevan polity. On the accession of Elizabeth they found little favor at her hands. The violent and unscrupulous adherents of the old vestments and ritualism of the Papal worship — the very party which, in a foreign land, had traitorously entered the "little congregation" at Frankfort — were repossessed of the old abodes of superstition, the cathedrals and rituals, and, under the authority of the Crown, — intent, as Tyndale foretold and Milton described it, on their "surplice brabble and tippet scuffle, . . . to force on their fellow subjects . . . the skeleton of a mass book," — renewed the old persecution. The story of their wrongs and oppression, revolting to justice and humanity, and of their loyalty to conscience, is the subject of Mr. Hopkins's admirable work, *The Puritans and Queen Elizabeth*.¹ Yet this very hierarchy had acknowledged and, even then, recognized the foreign reformed clergy, the Presbytery in Geneva, in Scotland, France, Germany, "even Presbytery of foreigners in their own streets, to be of the true Church of Christ."²

The Romish touch-stone of fidelity was in a rigid adherence to ritualistic ceremonies and observances. Calvin saw this,

¹ See also Punchard's *Congregationalism*, ii, ch. xi.

² Hopkins, i, p. 455.

and on this one point Calvin and the Pope thought alike. So long as this stronghold of superstition remained intact, Rome might hope to regain England.

The weak consciences of her subjects were more tender of offences against the priest than against the Decalogue. Elizabeth, inspired by policy rather than by piety, Romish or Protestant as affairs prompted, reconstructed the Church of Henry VIII, refusing the title of Supreme Head but taking that of "Governor of the Church of England," banished the crucifix from the altar, substituted the Liturgy for the Mass, and filled the Episcopal Sees with her creatures,¹ who ruled like tyrants.

But even these slight concessions to the Puritan spirit of innovation roused Pius V, the ex-Grand Inquisitor, who, March 28, 1569, excommunicated Elizabeth, with the usual ecclesiastical pomp of words, proclaimed her "a heretic and favorer of heretics," and absolved all her subjects from their oaths of allegiance, and made all who should obey her liable to excommunication, — all this because she had "ordered impious rites and ceremonies according to Calvin's "Institutes." ²

This fulmination of the papal curse was not then a solemn drollery, but a high warrant for conspiracy and assassination; it invoked the diabolism conceivable only under an institution which held that the "end justified the means," and consecrated perjury and violence in its service as acceptable to God, and to be rewarded with a heavenly crown. The massacre at Vassy, of St. Bartholomew's, the assassination of William of Orange, of Henry III and of Henry IV, all contemporary, were the work of the Jesuits, that brotherhood of the dagger and the bowl.³

Elizabeth was in peril; and so at a later date, 1618, it was a

¹ The "bishops did not blush to call themselves the creatures of James Stuart, dependant on him as the breath of their nostrils." McCrie's *Life of Andrew Melville*, Ed. 1856, pp. 252-263.

² Camden's *Elizabeth*, in *Kennett*, ii, pp. 427.

³ One of the deeds of this Pius V, when Grand Inquisitor, which "passed in atrocity the common atrociousness" of that church, was the murder of two thousand Vaudois peasants. Eighty men, women, and children were led out of a house, one by one, where stood a brawny ruffian with naked arms, red with blood, who cut the throat of each man as he passed out. Milman's *St. Paul*, p. 294. Mr. Motley says that when it was not in the power of man's ingenuity to add any fresh features of horror to the religious persecution under which the Dutch were groan-

delicate intimation of Gondomar to King James, "that if the Pope and Catholic princes had no hope of a remedy, both his person and crown would be in danger of a violent taking off."

The fathers of New England and the statesmen of the Commonwealth alike regarded the papal church as organized treason, ever waiting its opportunity. John Pym said in the Parliament of 1640, "The principles of poperie are such as are incompatible with any other religion. There may be a suspension of violence for some time, by certain respects, but the ultimate end even of that moderation is that they may with more advantage extirpate that which is opposite to them. Lawes will not restrain them, oathes will not." Our fathers deemed it not a speculative but a practical question, whether an organization, under whatever mask or pretence, secret in council, its priesthood cut off from all ties of state, society, and family, native to the church and alien to the country, without national sentiment or local attachment, and in all interests and events whatsoever bound to absolute submission to a foreign potentate,—whether such an organization is compatible with any other government.¹

In our own day the chieftain of this gliding, vermicular army renews the declarations of open war upon our free institutions, even upon that fundamental principle which distinguishes our American polity from that of Europe, whose debasing and deadening influences are illustrated in Spain, France, and Italy.

The doctrine² that "Liberty of conscience and of worship is the right of every man, a right which ought to be proclaimed and established by law in every well-established State," he, with brazen effrontery, denounces as "a liberty of perdition . . . destructive to all virtue and justice . . . depressing to all hearts and minds . . . against sound reason . . . impious and absurd . . .

ing, the Pope sent the fiendish Alva a jewelled hat and sword, with an autograph letter "to remember, when he put the hat upon his head, that he was guarded with it as with a helmet of righteousness, and with the shield of God's help, indicating the heavenly crown which was ready for all princes who support the Holy Church and the Roman Catholic faith." *Dutch Republic*, ii, 282-284.

¹ "Amsterdam admits of all religions but l'apists, . . . who, where'er they live, have another king at Rome; all other religions are subject to the present State, and have no prince elsewhere." Selden's *Table Talk*, 1650.

² Pius IX's *Encyclical*, Dec. 8, 1864.

false, perverse, and detestable . . . especially as they tend to shackle 'his' church . . . not only with regard to each individual man, but with regard to nations, peoples, and their rulers," all of whom, he demands, shall be "*compelled to inflict* the penalties of law upon violators of 'his' religion"; and so, with distinct declaration of war on our political institutions, as "a horrible plague," and this explicit purpose of using the sword, this infallible vicegerent "re-animates . . . warns and exhorts" all his hierarchal celibates, who have neither country nor home nor personal conscience, and all his "dear children" in his "church to repel and absolutely avoid the contagion" of "liberty of conscience," and to destroy the very basis of American freedom.

Whether such an organization was compatible with the safety of the Commonwealth, and whether its loyal and consistent members could also be "good citizens" thereof, was and is now a practical question.¹ The irreverent may smile, but this same authority prohibits and condemns all books or teachings which "endeavor to prove that the doctrine of the immobility of the sun in the centre of the world and the mobility of the earth is consonant to truth and not adverse to holy Scriptures."²

It will not be deemed irrelevant here to remember that the significant limitation of our constitutional guarantee to denominations and sects is to those who "demean themselves peaceably, and as good citizens of the Commonwealth"; but must a Commonwealth wait till the foundations are honey-combed, till treason has laid the train of ignorance, superstition, and passion,—wait till the explosion of bestial force in popular violence and anarchy? or anticipate the danger and save the republic? A wise man defined history as "philosophy teaching by example," and wise men may profit by the experience of all countries

¹ So the Presbyterian "setting up a spiritual tyranny by a secular power, to the advancing of their own authority above the magistrate, whom they would have made their executive to punish church delinquencies, whereof civil laws have no cognizance." Milton's *Description of the Westminster Assembly*, in *Harleian Miscellany*, x, 39.

² Papal bull of 1664, cited in *North British Review*, July, 1870, p. 282. June 16, 1633, Urban VIII, *ex cathedra*, ordered the sentence against Galileo's astronomical theory to be officially sent to all apostolic nuncios. *Macmillan's Magazine*, Dec. 1873.

against their common enemy. Mr. Webster's monitory words were "not to wait till great public mischiefs come, till the government is overthrown, or liberty itself put in extreme jeopardy. We should not be worthy sons of our fathers, were we so to regard great questions affecting the general freedom."

Despite infallible interpretation of prophets and psalms that a round world and antipodes would be unscriptural and heretical, a rebellion of nature against "the Church," Columbus sailed on his voyage of discovery; but no sooner was the fact known than the Pope divided this newly discovered portion of his estate among willing vassal princes, with a title good "to all eternity," as his *bull* reads, May 4, 1493.

Fearfully and intimately did European theologies, ethics, and politics affect American colonization: for example, the Huguenot colony in Brazil, 1556, projected by the illustrious Coligni as a refuge from papal persecution, was ruined by the treachery of the leader, and his defection to Rome. The Spaniard, Melendez, destroyed the Huguenot colony in Florida, in 1565, because they were heretics; "not," he said, "as Frenchmen, but as Lutherans"; and Dominique de Gourges, the avenger of that massacre, fitly inscribed on a tablet, "I do not this as to Spaniards, but as to traitors, robbers, and murderers." It was this which, fifty years later, deterred the Pilgrims from Spanish America; for, said Bradford,¹ "If they should ther live & doe well, the jealous Spaniard . . . would displate or overthrow them, as he did y^e French in Florida." James I murdered Sir Walter Raleigh as a peace-offering to Spanish colonial jealousy at the time the Pilgrims — preferring exile in America rather than in Holland — were pleading, by their friends of "good rank and quality," "that he would be pleased to grant them freedom of religion" in that desert; but so dead to shame, so eagerly servile was he to the imperious Philip's purpose of Romanizing Great Britain, that he would not "tolerate them by his public authoritie under his seal," but at the most, and that reluctantly, would "connive at them."

The Pilgrims upon reflection felt that "a scale as broad as y^e house floor" would be useless, and so without it "they must

rest. . . in God's providence, as they had done in other things," and prepared for their mission.

The colonization of South Carolina grew out of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, which cost France 50,000 Protestant families fleeing from the papal sword and fagot. New York was colonized by the liberty-loving and valorous Dutch, whose commercial enterprise baffled Spain.

Virginia, an "emunctory" for the waste of England, was colonized by a corporation whose laws exacted of "every man and woman" a rigid observance of the established religion, under penalty of the galleys, whipping-post, and even death.¹ It was this Anglo-Catholic mode of conversion that decided the Pilgrims "to live as a distincte body by themselves, . . . for it was objected, that if they lived among y^e English wh. wear ther planted, or so near to them as to be under their government, they should be in as great danger to be troubled and persecuted for the cause of religion, as if they lived in England, and it might be worse."² The spirit of those laws and of the church which invoked them remained. Despite their rigor, a few Puritans ventured into Virginia. In answer to their earnest call, New England sent ministers to preach the Gospel there, — the first in our missionary annals. This was an aggression not to be endured, and so Virginia exiled her non-conformists, among whom were some of her best and ablest men, one at least of whom Massachusetts especially welcomed and honored.³

Some of these Puritan exiles from Virginia went to Roman Catholic Maryland and were potent in its affairs for good. In his admirable address, *Maryland Two Hundred Years Ago*, Mr. Streeter says that the principal credit due to the proprietary and the people is, that having seen the need of the articles of toleration, "they acquiesced in them when presented to their

¹ Benedict's *Beginning of America*, 1860, p. 60.

² Bradford, 28.

³ "Some honest minded people in Virginia . . . sent earnest letters, and one or more messengers to the elders of these churches here for some of our ministers;" and Mr. Knolles of Watertown, Mr. Tomson of Braintree, and Mr. James of New Haven, were sent. . . . "What entertainment they found from the major part of the government there, I forbere to speak." Cotton's *Way Cleared*, 1648-76. Mather's *Magnalia*, B. iii, ch. xvii. Winthrop's *Journal*, ii, 78-95. Hubbard's *New England*, 410-522. *New England Hist. and Gen. Register*, i, 348.

consideration," and that the articles "originated from no congenial principle at that day recognized either in the Catholic or Protestant divisions of the church," but were drawn up in England in 1649, in deference to the progressive doctrines of the Independents."¹

Mr. Streeter speaks by the record. Plymouth, New England, had germinated those doctrines, and through Henry Vane and Cromwell they ruled England; and thus Plymouth dictated that Act which secured liberty of conscience, even in Roman Catholic Maryland.

That their assertion of their right to choose their own ministers was the only avowed reason for refusing the formal royal assent to the removal of the Pilgrim exiles to America, shows that the Crown was ruled by the Mitre, even in remotest things.²

From this, the line of contrasts between Jamestown and Plymouth will show two conflicting civilizations. The Jamestown colonists, rank and file, were sent out by a corporation, under the royal seal, for gain, more as if criminals than volunteers, to be governed by a code of Draconian severity, more like that of an army or a penitentiary than of civil life; their religion was reduced to a manual of mechanical routine, under a detective surveillance fatal to spontaneity, — the very essence of spiritual life, — under officers whose functions were more those of a police than of the civil magistracy of an orderly community; in brief, as dependants under rules and authority external to themselves, to which their assent was neither asked nor given, and to which their only relation was that of enforced obedience. For example, "Every man and woman duly twice a day, upon the first tolling of the bell, shall, upon the working days, repair unto the church to hear divine service" ("according to the doctrine, rites, and religion now professed and established within our realms of England"), "upon pain of losing his or her day's allowance for the first omission, for the second to be whipt, for the third to be condemned to the galleys for six months. . . . And also every man and woman shall repair in the morning to the divine

¹ Before the Maryland Historical Society, May 20, 1852, p. 41.

² Bradford, 29, 35.

service, and sermons preached upon the Sabbath day ; and in the afternoon to divine service and catechising, upon pain for the first fault to lose their provision and allowance for the whole week following ; for the second, to lose the said allowance and also to be whipped, and also for the third to suffer death.”¹

“ There is not one man nor woman in this colony now present, or hereafter to arrive, . . . if they shall refuse . . . to give an account of their faith . . . unto the minister, . . . the governor shall cause the offender, for the first time of refusal, to be whipt, for the second time to be whipt twice, and to acknowledge the fault upon the Sabbath day in the assembly of the congregation ; and for the third time, to be whipt every day until he should submit to the priestly inquisition.”

“ Not an element of popular liberty,” says Bancroft, “ was introduced into the form of government.” Evidently, the state was auxiliary to “ church ” missionary work, its chief appeals to conscience and means to conversion being the whipping-post and gallows. True it is, “ the priest of superstition rides an ass, but the priest of fanaticism a tiger.”² Thus the Virginians were driven to

— “ love the Church that claims our awe
Tow’rd holy Truth, by force of Statute Law.
And helps free grace to gain the Soul’s assent,
And cleanse our sins, by Act of Parliament.”

Now for the contrast : The Plymouth colonists were “ not a corporation, but knit together by a voluntary combination.”³ Without the royal seal, they were volunteers, free

“ To ask what’s reason,” not “ proclaim what’s writ ” by despots,

Self-dependent, self-reliant, self-governing, under their own laws and their own officers, under a constitution adopted and signed in a convention of “ the people, in whom,” said Mr. John Cotton in 1640,⁴ “ fundamentally all power lies.”

In this compact, the theme of philosophers and statesmen and the model for all times, they covenant as follows : —

¹ Mr. Benedict’s *The Beginning of America*, 1863, p. 58. Force’s Tracts, i.

² Isaac Taylor’s *Natural History of Enthusiasm*.

³ Smith’s *History*, 247. Bradford’s *Plymouth*, 2, 4-26-32.

⁴ Trumbull’s *Lechford*, note 34.

"We, . . . in y^e presence of God, and one of another, covenant & combine ourselves together into a civill body politick — . . . and by vertue hearof to enacte, constitute, and frame such just & equall lawes, ordinances, & offices, from time to time, as shall be thought most meete and convenient for y^e generall good, . . . unto which we promise all due submission and obedience." ¹

It was an easy process ; its controlling influence went through the successive New England colonies.

As early as 1636, in the feebleness of feudal authority under Gorges, the Saco planters, thrown upon their natural rights, entered into a like popular combination, under whose authority even Bonython's co-patentee, Thomas Lewis, was cited to answer for contempt.² The next year, 1636, Rhode Island presents this remarkable document ³:—

"We, whose names are hereunder, desirous to inhabit in the town of Providence, do promise to subject ourselves in active or passive obedience to all such orders or agreements as shall be made for public good of the body, in an orderly way, by the major assent of the present inhabitants, masters of families, incorporated together into a town fellowship, and such others whom they shall admit unto them, only in civil things ;" and thus, as Mr. Arnold says, "ignoring any power in the body politic to interfere with those matters that concern alone man and his Maker."

So the Connecticut planters, under their leader, Mr. Thomas Hooker, the old London friend of the Pilgrims, Jan. 14, 1639, formed a constitution "to maintain peace and union" by "an orderly and decent government, established according to God, to order and dispose of the affairs of the people at all seasons, as occasion shall require, do therefore," say they "associate and conjoin ourselves to be as one public State or Commonwealth." ⁴

And "on the 4th day of the 4th month called June," of the same year, "all" the New Haven planters, — Eaton, Goodwin, Hopkins, and the rest, — under the lead of their pastor, Mr. John Davenport,⁵ "assembled together in a general meet-

¹ Bradford's *Plymouth*, pp. 66, 89.

² Folsom's *Saco and Biddeford*, p. 49.

³ Arnold's *Rhode Island*, i, pp. 102-103.

⁴ Trumbull's *Hist. of Connecticut*, 1797, pp. 47-48-95. Trumbull's *Col. Rec. of Connecticut*, i, 20-26.

⁵ Hoadly's *New Haven Col. Rec.*, i, 11-19. Trumbull's *Hist. of Connecticut*, Ed. 1797, i, p. 533.

ing to consult about settling a civil government, according to God, . . . seeing they were free to cast themselves into that mould and form of Commonwealth which appeareth best for them."¹

So in 1639 the Exeter planters, "destitute . . . of wholesome laws and civil government, . . . in the name of Christ and in the sight of God," say we, "combine ourselves together to erect and set up among us such government as shall be to our best discerning agreeable to the will of God"; and a year later the Dover planters, Larkham, the Waldernes, and thirty-eight others, "whose names are underwritten, . . . have voluntarily agreed to combine ourselves into a body politic," to be governed by "such laws as shall be concluded by a major part of the freemen."² Again, in 1643,³ articles of confederation betwixt the plantations under the "several governments of Massachusetts, Plimouth, Connecticut, and of New Haven, with the plantations in combination therewith," were entered into under the name of "The United Colonies of New England."⁴ The preamble recites that "whereas, we all came into these parts of America with one and the same end and ayme, . . . are encompassed with people of several nations and strange languages, . . . and . . . seeing the sad distractions in England, . . . enter into a present consociation amongst ourselves for mutual help and strength in all our future concerns." They neither call themselves "subjects," nor even allude to a "king." It was an international league of Independent Commonwealths, without the baubles of a crown or a mitre.

¹ Trumbull's *Hist. of Connecticut*, Ed. 1818, i, pp. 502, 504.

² Farmer's *Belknap*, 432-433. Among them were Wheeler, Mr. Wheelwright, the minister, one of Winthrop's Exiles, Rishworth, Dearborn, Wentworth, Lamson, and Purmot, the schoolmaster.

³ Hoadly's *New Haven Col. Rec.*, 161, 562.

⁴ "It originated," says Chalmers, *Annals*, ch. 8, "with Massachusetts, always fruitful in projects of independence. No patent legalized the confederacy, which continued until the dissolution of the charters in 1686. Neither the consent nor approbation of the governing powers in England was ever applied for or given. The principles upon which this famous association was formed were altogether those of self-government, of absolute sovereignty." As to why Rhode Island and "Agamenticus, a poor village, lately made a corporation," did not join, see Arnold's *History of Rhode Island*, i, 115, 156-158, 340.

Thus it appears that at Jamestown the colonist was a servant, in Plymouth, a citizen; one was an agent, the other a principal; the one obeyed implicitly, without reason, the other obeyed with reason: in brief, one lived by *rule*, the other by *law*, — they were “a law unto themselves.”

Force and fear were essential to the first, intelligence and virtue to the other; and these were their respective bases.

In exact accord with these contrasts, there was still another rudimental difference between Jamestown and Plymouth, which ended in the conflict that so lately convulsed the nation. In one was cherished the feudal sentiment of contempt for labor, and a social degradation of the workingman, ever fruitful of ignorance, indolence, barbarism, woe, and general decay; in the other, labor was honorable and honored, making the North a field of intelligent industry, virtue, temperance, and frugality, where free institutions — the school, meeting-house, and college — were the fruits and the stay of Christian civilization.

In England the Pilgrims “had only been used to a plaine countrie life and y^e innocent trade of husbandrie,” and in exile in Holland, “they fell to such trades and employments as they best could, valuing peace & their spirituall comforte above any other riches whatever. At length,” says Bradford, “they came to raise a competence & comfortable living, but with hard and continual labor.”

Governor Carver died from overwork in the field in seed-time; and Governor Winthrop, the successor of Conant and Endicott, was “in plaine apparel assisting in any ordinary labor.”¹

“Thus to men cast in that heroic mould
Came Empire, such as Spaniard never knew, —
Such Empire as beseems the just and true;
And, at the last, almost unsought, came gold.”²

In Virginia the church maintained its legal position, yet it seems the atmosphere was not wholly congenial, since its

¹ *Historical Magazine*, iii, 261–263, 358–359, iv, 4–6; Punchard's *Hist. of Congregationalism*, iii, chap. xii, xv, as to the occupations of the Pilgrims; Bradford's *Plymouth*, 100; Sainsbury's *Col. Papers*, 1574–1660, 156, 632.

² Richard Monckton Milnes, Lord Houghton.

staunch defender, Governor Berkeley, passionately wished his clergy would "pray oftener and preach less," for, said he, "learning has brought disobedience, heresy, and sects into the world, and printing has divulged them. Thank God, here are no free schools nor printing, and I hope we shall have none these hundred years." Whether the Governor's thanks were due heavenward, some may doubt; but certain it is his pious ejaculations rested on Virginia near two hundred years, till, in the course of human events, freedmen and free schools invaded her sacred soil. Yet sects, like sin, will intrude, and it is said that Virginia Baptists gave to Patrick Henry and Thomas Jefferson useful ideas in government, much talked about since July 4th, 1776. Canada, in the mean time colonized by the French, was absolutist, — had no people: there was only priest and king.

But the New England colonies represented other shades of opinions in Old England, and there again we must search for their *incunabula* and study their origin.

Wicliffe's vernacular Bible disturbed Rome by exciting doubt, irreverence, and endless disputes; and Tyndale followed up the assault by printing the New Testament in English, to the dismay of all true churchmen. In 1525 he published an address to the people denouncing the prelates as "so bedlam as to affirm that good is the natural cause of evil, and darkness to proceed out of light, and that lying should be grounded in truth and verity; and not rather clear contrary that light destroyeth the darkness, and verity reproveth all manner of lying." It was the old fight between darkness and light. The one, resting on force, was established in Virginia, followed by centuries of popular ignorance: the other, resting on Scripture and reason, — "the God within the mind," — found refuge at Plymouth, established free schools and printing, and the result is before us.

In the intense awakening that came of the labors of Wicliffe and Tyndale, the conception of the relation of religion and law, of conscience and the state, was gained by slow and painful steps. The present order of ideas was inverted, and under "the enormous faith of many made for one"; there was no

society, no public opinion, no people, but a crowd,¹—the populace, a herd, whose owners were the bishop and the king. These institutions were not considered as means to the common welfare, but only to the benefit of the few.

Our American principles of government would have been considered as worthy of pandemonium. The rights of conscience, recognized and protected by our constitutional law, so that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification for any office or public trust ; freedom of speech and freedom of the press ; the free exercise of any religion without any “ establishment ” ; that all religious societies, sects, and denominations shall ever have the right to elect their pastors and teachers, and shall be equally under the protection of the law, and have no legal preference of one over another, axioms in our politics, would, even if dreamed of, have been held as the vagaries of enthusiasts, fatally subversive of all order and private or public safety.

Within memory, the Declaration of Independence, which is declared in the able commentary of Dr. Farrar² to be “ the law of the land,” has been called a declaration of “ sounding and glittering generalities ” ; but the defeat of “ our misguided brethren ” in the late Rebellion has vindicated and established that great charter. It was in that faith the great contest was waged and won. The pioneers of the forlorn hope of freedom die in dungeons or on the scaffold ; but after ages build monuments to them as to the friends of humanity.

To the crouching timidity of the conservatives of his time,

¹ The Statutes of Clarendon, 1164, Jan. 25, the murder of Becket, 1170, Dec. 29, the demand of the archbishop and barons at St. Edmonsbury, 1214, Nov. 20, and their compact with the king at Runnymede, Magna Charta, 1215, Jan. 15—tell of temporary resistance to papal avarice, and the enormous claim of the Roman Church to supremacy above all human authority, to the exclusive power of defining her jurisdiction as to where her own province ends and the state's begins,—more than an *imperium in imperio*, an *imperium super imperium*,—a claim as insolently made now and here as then and there. The relief was to the “ clergy ” and the barons, not to the multitude, who had no conscious life : there were no people ; there were villeins without voice or lot in the matter. Prof. Stubbs' *Constitutional History of England*, § 132. So it continued, not much for the better in law or in fact, till the first popular constitutional convention was convened in New England, November 11
21, 1620.

² *Manual of the Constitution*, §§ 231-232.

Milton answered, "We must not run, they say, into sudden extremes. . . . If it be found that those two extremes be vice and virtue, falsehood and truth, the greater the extremity of virtue and superlative truth we run into the more virtuous and the more wise we become ; and he that, flying from degenerate and traditional corruption, fears to shoot himself far into the meeting embraces of a divinely warranted Reformation, had better not have run at all. And for the suddenness it cannot be feared. Who should oppose it? The papists? They dare not. The protestants otherwise affected? They were mad. . . . Our brethren of the reformed churches abroad ventured (God being their guide) out of rigid popery into that which we in mockery call precise puritanism, and yet we see no inconvenience befell them. Had it not been the obstinate perverseness of our prelates against the divine and admirable spirit of Wicliffe, to suppress him as a schismatic and innovator, perhaps neither the Bohemian Husse and Jerome, no, nor the name of Luther or of Calvin, had ever been known: the glory of reforming all our neighbors had been completely ours. But now, as our obdurate clergy have with violence demeaned the matter, we are become hitherto the latest and the backwardest scholars of whom God offered to have made us the teachers."

As the basis of a hierarchy is dogma and authority, it is incompatible with the spirit of inquiry, freedom of thought, and intellectual progress ; it is intolerant, and therefore cruel. As established in England, the spirit of bigotry, of despotism, asserted itself. The reaction was soon felt. The movement was retrogressive towards Rome. The Church of England was sliding back into the depths.

As early as 1589, Lord Bacon noted that "some indiscreet persons have been bold . . . to use dishonorable and derogatory speeches and censure of the churches abroad, and that so far, some of our men [as I have heard] ordained in foreign parts, have been pronounced to be no lawful ministers," and he also censures the wrongs of the established hierarchy towards them as not to "be dissembled or excused."¹ So narrow had they become that Laud opposed aid to the banished ministers of the

¹ *Works of Lord Bacon*. Spedding's edition, i, 84-89.

palatinate because they were Calvinists and Presbyterians and called Rome antichristian, for if Rome could not "confer sacerdotal power in ordination, and the English Church had no orders but what she derives from Rome," what must follow? Had the prelate forgotten the irresistible argument of Chillingworth, that the chance of true ordination in the Church of Rome is "even cousin-german to impossible," and that it is "plainly impossible that any man should be so much as morally certain either of his own priesthood or any other man's"?¹

— "Whatever link you strike,
Tenth or ten thousandth, breaks the chain alike."

But there was in the strife the new element already alluded to, — the political aspects of the Reformation. When the same head, virtually, wore the mitre and the crown, and the same hand wielded the crozier and the sword, then, by necessity, the laity, the people, became a political power, the party of reform, of progress, if need be, of revolution, and steadily gained till Independency — manhood — abolished the mitre and the crown, and placed Cromwell at the head of the Commonwealth. With what rapture did Milton witness the resurrection! "Methinks I see in my mind a noble and puissant nation rousing herself like a strong man after sleep, and shaking her invincible locks; methinks I see her an eagle reviving her mighty youth, and kindling her undazzled eyes at the full mid-day beam; purging and unscaling her long-abused sight at the fountain itself of heavenly radiance; while the whole noise of timorous and flocking birds, with those also that love the twilight, flutter about amazed at what she means, and in their envious gabble would prognosticate a year of sects and schisms."

"'Shorn hypocrites, the psalm-singers, gloomy bigots,'" such were the names," says Taine, by which men who reformed the manners and renewed the constitution of England were insulted. But oppressed and insulted as they were, their work [Reformation] continued of itself . . . and under the insensible progress of national sympathy, as well as under the incessant

¹ Neal's *Puritans*, i, ch. v. *The Religion of Protestants*, Bohn's Ed. 1846, pp. 114-116, 448.

effort of public reflection, parties and doctrines were to rally around a free and moral Protestantism.”¹

But for the Puritans, the Inquisition would have sunk England to a level with Spain and Italy. Listen to Milton again : “ If to bring a numb and chill stupidity of soul, an inactive blindness of mind upon the people, by their leaden doctrine or no doctrine at all ; if to prosecute all knowing and zealous Christians by the violence of their courts, be to keep away schism indeed ; and by this kind of discipline, all Italy and Spain is as purely and practically kept from schism as England hath been of them. With as good plea might the dead palsy boast to a man, It is I that free you from stitches and pains, and the troublesome feelings of cold and heat, of wounds and strokes ; if I were gone, all these would molest you. . . . Where are those schismatics [Puritans] with whom the prelates hold such hot skirmish ? Show us your acts, those obvious annals, which your [High Commission and Star Chamber] courts of loathed memory, lately deceased, have left us. . . . They are only such . . . as are offended with your lawless government, your ceremonies, your liturgy, an extract of the mass book translated. But that they should be contemners of public prayer, and churches used without superstition, I trust God will manifest ere long to be a false slander . . . A tympanum of Spaniolized bishops swaggering in the foretop of the State . . . no marvel though they think it as unsafe to commit religion and liberty to their care as to a synagogue of Jesuits.”

Thus was evoked the spirit which culminated in the glorious Commonwealth. Macaulay places the Parliament of 1640 among “ the great eras in the history of the civilized world,” and adds, “ whatever of political freedom exists either in Europe or in America has sprung, directly or indirectly, from those institutions which they secured or reformed ; ” and adds, “ We never turn to the annals of those times without feeling increased admiration of the patriotism, the energy, the decision, the consummate wisdom which marked the measures of that great Parliament, from the day on which it met to the commencement of civil hostilities. Every reason which can be

¹ *Areopagitica*, Bohn's Ed. ii, 94. *The Renaissance*, Milton. Taine's *English Literature*, New York Ed. 1872, i, 408.

urged in favor of the revolution of 1688 may be urged with at least equal force in favor of what is called the great rebellion." Even Robert Southey says, "I have more respect for the Independents than for any other body of Christians, the Quakers excepted; their English history is without a blot." Be it remembered, all the while, that this Independency, till then vague, only a dream, as a tangible thing and a successful experiment, and the Commonwealth as its daughter, must date from Plymouth.¹

The same power which, with characteristic treachery to the spirit of the Reformation, lifted Laud to authority as the exponent, the very soul of the Episcopal movement, persisted in a scheme whose purpose was equally treasonable to the state. Our limits permit only a brief review of the course of events; but recently published documents open the secrets of the times, and vindicate the sagacity and statesmanship that saved England and the world from a relapse into mediæval darkness.

It was as early as 1604 — the advent of the quarrel between the hierarchy and the people — that James I denounced the Puritans, saying, "The revolt in the Low Countries, which had lasted ever since he was born, and whereof he never expected to see an end, began first by a petition for matters of religion. That he and his mother, from their cradles, had been haunted with a Puritan devil, which he feared would not leave him to

¹ "The church, if a convention of clergymen making canons must be called by that name," is the concise definition of the hierarchal church, given by John Locke, the Independent, and pupil of John Owen, in his letter on toleration, written in exile, but published in England in the year of the second Revolution. The very opposite of this is the theory of Independency, Congregationalism, voluntary combination. "The principle of religious liberty is almost logically bound up with the theory of the independency of particular churches," says Mr. Masson (in his *Life of Milton and his Times*, iii, 99), and it is the fundamental principle of American government.

This polity of the strong men — Goodwin, Owen, Peter, Vane, Milton, Cromwell, and their fellows — to whom, under God, was confided the immediate future of England, as well as a permanent influence on the spirit of her laws and government, was moulded in the freer life and thought of New England by their correspondents and fellow-workers, Cotton, Williams, Hooker, and the like, — a fresh field of inquiry for one who would relish the duty suggested by Mr. Carlyle, to hunt up "the interesting reciprocities and mutualities between New England and her old mother, which ought to be disentangled, to be made conspicuous and beautiful," — a work which these pages may initiate.

his grave.¹ That he would hazard his crown, but he would suppress their malicious spirits." The unequal contest dethroned the Stuarts, and did cost two of his family the crown and one of them his head.

For years the fate of New England was as that of a shuttlecock. An intermarriage with the family that had blasted Spain with the Inquisition and drenched the Netherlands with Christian blood, was the ambition of James Stuart, to secure which he made eager proffer of personal and national servitude. The bigot, Philip, hoped to gain by the weakness and treachery of Stuart and his court what the Armada had failed to win by force, — the extension over Great Britain of the Roman Catholic sway which had palsied his own subjects. This was his sole thought, and for this he would barter his own daughter ; but the Puritan forbade the banns. In his despatch from the English Court, March $\frac{1}{2}\frac{5}{5}$, 1620, to his Spanish master, the assiduous Gondomar² wrote, "The King remembered very well that I had told him three or four years ago that his secretary Winwood was a Puritan, an enemy of Spain, and a Dutchman, and that he had tried to verify what I had said, and found that I had spoken the truth in this, as I always did ; and that from that time he had taken his favor from Winwood, so that he died of sorrow. Yet he must tell me that after I was gone the malice of these people (the Puritans) so increased that he had now three hundred Winwoods in his court and palace," and so he "wiped the sweat from his forehead" !

And we have, too, the ambassador's report of a conversation of about the same date with Prince Charles and Lord Digby : "We talked about the Puritans and of the great number of

¹ It began with the "Request" of the Low Countries that the Spanish Inquisition might not be established on their territory, and ended forty-three years afterward in the vindication of man's prerogative of thought, his rescue from moral death, and the Independence of the Dutch States. — Motley's *Netherlands*. This revolting levity at the fiendish bigotry of Rome and Spain in the Netherlands, the story of whose deeds makes man to blush for his race, thus early disclosed the moral penury of James I. He had not even the apology of bigotry, sincerity, for he sat on a Protestant throne. Cowardice and cruelty distinguished this king, who was true neither to his country nor his God. The Puritan resisted his misrule and treachery, and that of his successors, who were worthy of their lineage.

² *The Spanish Match*. Camden Society, 1869, 135, 148, 160, 170, 175, 177, 186, 212, 277, 280, 307, 316, 322, 327.

them there were in his household, not at all to his satisfaction. He laughed very much when I told him that his father had lately said the same thing to me." "Lord Digby affirmed that "the King's intentions were very good in all matters relating to Spain, but that he found himself so solitary and so encircled by Puritans and by our enemies, that he had neither means nor power to do good," and that "at last he and the King were left alone in England" on the Spanish side.

During this dalliance of Stuart weakness and the court soldiers of fortune with Spanish ambassadors and Papal intrigue, Puritanism led off in opposition and became the party of constitutional freedom, the aggressive party for parliamentary government against prelatic and royal despotism under pretence of "divine right."

It was at this time that a party of John Robinson's exiles at Leyden sought, pleaded for, permission to colonize in America.

It is natural that we should speak fondly of England as our mother, yet our fathers thought she showed little love and less wisdom when with prelatic madness she drove her best children off the island because they did not relish the spiritual nostrums which the Anglican prelates — "froked" by the King and not by pope "infallible" — would force on all alike. They could not withhold what we took with us, the best portion of our birthright, our Teutonic blood and our English Bible.

The escape from the Inquisitorial terrors of England to the Netherlands, where the grand basis of civil liberty — freedom of conscience — was more nearly realized than in any other country, taught the Pilgrims a lesson of contrasts. Abiding long enough with our liberty-loving and hospitable cousins — the drama of whose glorious struggle for manhood in the brilliant pages of our own Motley should be as a hand-book in every family — to study their institutions, especially to observe their "schools everywhere provided at the public expense,"¹ the Pilgrims hoisted sail, and with the three essentials, good blood,

¹ "Schools everywhere provided at the public expense"; but, at the suggestion of Dr. Henry Barnard, looking at Mr. Brodhead's authority (Davies' Holland, ii, 202, 203), I find that it was a church institution, not a public free school. The error stands corrected.

the open Bible, and a public school,¹ began life in New England, Nov. 21, 1620.

Wise in council, holy in thought, heroic in temper, of industrious and blameless life, yet as asserters of the principle of popular constitutional government, the broad foundation of that common freedom in which we, their heirs, rejoice,—viz. the rights of conscience, thought, and speech,—these people were in legal and social outlawry. For them to be banished was to be set free. “No rabble, sir priest,” said Milton, “but . . . good Protestants . . . at first by those of your tribe they were called Lollards and Hussites, so now by you be termed Puritans and Brownists . . . But my hope is, that the people of England will not suffer themselves to be juggled thus out of their faith and religion by a mist of names cast before their eyes, but will search wisely by the Scriptures . . . knowing that the primitive Christians in their times were accounted such as are now called Familists and Adamites, or worse . . . Forsooth if they [the prelates] be put down, a deluge of innumerable sects will follow ; we shall be all Brownists, Familists, Anabaptists. For the word Puritan seems to be quashed, and all that heretofore were counted such are now Brownists.”²

At home, hunted by ecclesiastical catch-poles, the Pilgrims had been accustomed to ask, “What will the government do with us ?” but within a few weeks, even before they left the cabin of the May-Flower, a very different question, before unheard of, “What shall we do with the government ?” was solved in their constitutional convention of Nov. 21, 1620. Passive subjects in England, by a mere transfer to a transatlantic shore, they at once took practical lesson in self-government, adopted a constitution, made laws, and elected officers. Wife and mother—the family—were there. There were the integrals of a nation. They had been subjects, abject, if no worse ; they were now citizens, freeholders.

This transfer of power was revolutionary, not wrung, as in

¹ Early in 1624 Gov. Bradford wrote : “We have no commone schoole for want of a fitt person, or hithertoo means to maintaine one ; though we desire now to begine.” *Hist. of Plymouth*, 162.

² *The Reason of Church Government Urged Against Prelaty*. 1641. Prose Works, Bohn’s Ed., ii, 462, 464. “Both ways [Brownism and Independency] really are one and the same.” Baylies’ *Dissuasive*. 1645. p. 58.

Europe, after infinite delays, from the king, the aristocracy, and middle classes, but returning directly to the people, the working men, for there were none other at Plymouth. While in England, for claiming what are to us rights as free and unquestioned as the air we breathe, they were a reproach and a by-word among the "faithful," whose quiet was still to be troubled even unto dissolution with radical ideas from New England, as little to be controlled as the winds from heaven.

Breathing the more bracing air of absolute independence, thinking and acting in their own democratic way, with no room for crown or mitre, they were in a position for that free inquiry which is of the essence, the verity of Christianity, ever tending to the highest type of manhood.

What higher guarantee can there be for the detection of error and the conservation of truth than the ingenuous and eager readiness for more light displayed in these radiant sentences? "The Lord hath more truth and light yet to break forth from his Holy Word," in John Robinson's farewell to the Pilgrims at Leyden in 1620; and in 1624, when "church" bigotry would still deprive the Pilgrims of their pastor, Mr. Robinson, "unless he and they will reconcile themselves to our church" of England, they answered, "We may erre, and other churches may erre, and doubtless doe in many circumstances. That honour, therefore belongs only to y^e infallible Word of God, and pure Testamente of Christ, to be propounded and followed as y^e only rule and pattern for direction herein to all churches and Christians. And it is too great arrogancie for any man or church to thinke y^t he or they have so sounded y^e Word of God to y^e bottome, as precislie to sett downe y^e churches discipline, without error in substance or circumstance, as y^t no other without blame may digress or differ in anything from y^e same."¹

Or consider this, from Mr. John Cotton's letter to Archbishop Usher, May 31, 1626: "You shall find me . . . glad to receive such light, as God shall be pleased to impart to me by you."² Or yet again, his words to Mr. Roger Williams, in 1637: "Be ready in preparation of heart as you shall see more

¹ Bradford's *History of Plymouth*, 178.

² *N. E. Hist. and Gen. Reg.* 1870, 356.

light, so to hate more and more every false way"; and, again, five years later, "The Word hath promised more and more light shall breake forth in these times, . . . we shall sinne against the Grace and Word of truth, if we confine our truth either to the Divines of present or former ages."¹

John Davenport came to New England "resolved," he said, "to drive things . . . as near to the precept and pattern of Scripture as they could be driven." In his public letter of 1646, Mr. Hugh Peter said, "Keep a window open to more light and truth." "Yea, one Scripture in the mouth of a mechanic before any decree of the whole council," said Mr. Roger Williams in his "Queries" to Parliament, in 1643,² and he quotes a letter from Mr. Cotton,³ "professing to expect a far greater light than yet shines."

I said that the intolerance which deprived the Pilgrims of their pastor, Mr. John Robinson, is at the historical foundation of Massachusetts. After their violation of contract with Mr. Robinson and his church had compelled the separation of pastor and people at Leyden,—the farewell so dear to the lovers of the brave, true, and beautiful, illustrated by history, poetry, and art,—some of the "most religious" of those "merchant adventurers" began to think they "should sin against God in keeping plighted faith and word with Mr. Robinson and his company," unless they would first "reconcile themselves to our church," of England, "by a written recantation." Some of these "bitter professed adversaries," "plotted" against the Pilgrims, "against their peace both in respecte of their civill and church state." It is "by these men's means," says Governor Bradford, "our pastor [Robinson] is kept from us, and then (they) reproach us with it."⁴

A reverend conspirator, employed by the "partners in trade," John Lyford,⁵ wrote to them from Plymouth "that y Leyden

¹ *Of Set Forms of Prayer*, 1642, p. 45.

² When Charles II expressed his surprise to Dr. Owen at his practice of hearing a tinker (Bunyan) preach, the Dr. replied: "Had I the tinker's abilities, please your Majesty, I would most gladly relinquish my learning."

³ Cotton's letter was printed in 1643, Peter's in 1646, Robinson's in 1647. See page 110 of Mr. John Ward Dean's *Memoir of Nathaniel Ward*, a model of arrangement and thoroughness of research.

⁴ Bradford's *History of Plymouth*, pp. 43, 118, 197, 166, 175.

⁵ The historical parallel of the "troubles at Frankfort" with Lyford's treachery at Plymouth is noteworthy.

company (Mr. Robinson & y^e rest) must still be kepte back, or els all wil be spoyled. And least any of them should be taken in privatly somewher on y coast of England (as it was feared might be done), they must chaing the mr. of y ship (Mr. William Peirce), and put another allso in Winslow's stead, for marchante, or els it would not be prevented," but if they failed "to cary & over-bear things, it will be best for them to plant els wher." After the detection and defeat of the plot, Mr. John Oldham, also prominent in the conspiracy at Plymouth, confessed his evil deeds and promised that "those in England" should not "use him as an instrumente any longer against them [the Pilgrims] in any thing."¹

With steadfast purpose, patient endurance, and Christian magnanimity, the Pilgrims maintained their integrity and position over inveterate prejudice, and despite false friends, violated contract, and priestly conspiracy. Their "most religious" adversaries did "plant els wher," and that new colony under the more magnanimous Roger Conant, was the political beginning of Massachusetts.

At a later date, November 15, 1626, a compromise or agreement between the "adventurers" and Pilgrims discloses the names of several of the "most religious" gentlemen who had formed the New Dorchester Company. We have the names of two ecclesiastics — priest and prelate — who were busy in this movement, — Mr. White, of Dorchester, the "Father" of Massachusetts, and Mr. Lake, successor of Laud as Bishop of Bath and Wells.

In conversation with his friend, Mr. Hugh Peter, years after, Mr. White referred to Bishop Lake's zeal in his sermon, July 2, 1625, in which he contrasts English apathy with Romish proselytism in America, and to his declaration to White that "he would go himself, but for his age." "Yea," said Mr. Peter, White and Lake "occasioned, yea, founded that work, and much in reference to the Indians." Lake was a moderate man, like Mr. Williams, Bishop of Lincoln, who, more like a Christian than a Churchman, was wisely blind for many years to the non-conformity of Mr. Cotton, Rector of St. Botolph's, Boston, and was also honored by the fierce hatred of Laud the bigot. Bishop

¹ Bradford's *History of Plymouth*, 172, 179, 180.

Lake died May 4, 1626, before Governor Conant removed the colonial seat from Cape Ann to Salem.¹

The "occasion" for this new colony, then, was the Pilgrims' inflexible fidelity to conviction. If they had faltered, if Robinson had wavered, and the Hierarchy had captured Plymouth, how different had been the current of history!

Thus we trace the course and results of the prelatie "dislike" to Plymouth "Independency," and their movements, just in their embryonic state, prefatory to organization and formal record, as the rival colony of Massachusetts and still within the "establishment." But the labor was in vain; the "plot" failed; for we have it from the lips of Mr. Winslow, of Plymouth, that they "came at [the] first to them at Plimmouth, to crave their direction in church courses and made them their pattern."²

The new colony, at once leavened by Plymouth ideas and influence, adopted the principles and practice of what is known as Massachusetts "Congregationalism"; and Massachusetts was soon reputed in England to be "a nursery of schismatics . . . faction and rebellion" against "religion," that is, against Laud and the Church of England. Mr. White of Dorchester was himself obliged to record the fact.³ Fourteen years later, 1644, the Presbyterian, Mr. Rathband, noted that the Plymouth polity was "much commended by Mr. John Cotton" and adopted by the successive colonies, and — deprecating the liking of "many" in England, "especially" in London, for the "popular synods" — he asks, "How will our late solemn league with God and one another stand with the opinion of many of them that hold the magistrate hath nothing to do in matter of religion . . . and cannot lawfully compel men to enter into covenant with God?"⁴

¹ Mr. Haven on the Massachusetts Company. *Arch. Americana*, iii. Bradford's *History of Plymouth*, 172, 179, 180, *sub anno*. Thornton's *Landing at Cape Ann*, 39, and *Pulpit of the American Revolution*. 1860. xvi, xx. Anderson's *Col. Church*, xiv.

² Rathband's *Narrative*. 1644.

³ White's *Planters' Plea*, in Force's Tracts, vols. ii, iii. Rathband's *Narrative*, 1644, i, 33. *Mass. H. C.*, 13: 66-75.

⁴ The mooted point whether or not they had fixed on a form of church government before leaving England is settled by the following: "Mr. Hildersham did much grieve when he understood that the brethren in *New England* did depart from the Presbyterian government; and he said this mischief had been prevented,

In a letter to Governor Bradford,¹ June 4, 1634, Governor Dudley mentions rumors from England "of some trials which are shortly like to fall upon us," on which Bradford remarks, "ther was cause enough of these feares, which arise by y^e underworking of some enemies to y^e churches here." Archbishop Laud had procured a royal commission, April 28, 1634, which gave the colonies and colonists, body and soul, life and limb, in absolute ownership and slavery to the mere discretion and lawless, irresponsible will of the primate and his associates. It would have satisfied a Caraffa or an Alva; but it was futile, impossible.

if my counsel at Mr. Higginson's going over [1628] had been taken; which was, that brethren driven thither by Episcopalian persecution should agree upon the Church Government before they depart from hence. And it is well known that many Presbyterian non-conformists, did, by a letter sent unto New England, bewaile their departing in practice from Presbyterians . . . who, the world knoweth, are Antagonists to Independency. . . . Is it not probable, that if Mr. Cotton and Mr. Hooker had stayd in their native country, they would not have been at such a distance from church fellowship with their Presbyterian brethren, as Old England Independents are . . . who boast of these worthies [of New England] as *their predecessors* in Wayes of Independency . . . superlatively famous . . . therefore *their judgment* is most frequently insisted upon." *Irenicum*, London, 1659, x, xi.

¹ "There was cause enough." Bradford, pp. 320, 456. The Commission is at length in Hubbard's *Hist. of N. E.*, chap. xxxvi.

Heylin, in his *Life of Laud*, says, "It was once under consultation of the physicians [Laud & Co.] . . . to send a bishop over to them for their better government, and to back him with some forces to compel, if he were not otherwise able to persuade obedience; but this design was strangled in the first conception, by the violent breaking out of the troubles in Scotland." . . . He adds, "The principal bell-wethers of these flocks were Cotton, Chauncey, Wells [Thomas Weld], Hooker, and perhaps Hugh Peters."

We have another account of the matter by Sir Simon D'Ewes, who says, the "Episcopal enemies of New England had at several times given out reports that a bishop and a governor should be sent amongst them to force upon them the yoke of our ceremonies and intermixtures, so to deter others from going. And, indeed, at this time [1634], the same report was more likely to be fulfilled than ever before or since; for one, Sir Ferdinando Gorges, was nominated for governor, and there was a consultation had to send him thither with a thousand soldiers: a ship was now in building, and near finished to transport him by sea, and much fear there was amongst the Godly lest that infant Commonwealth and Church should have been ruined by him; when God, that had carried so many weak and crazy ships thither, so provided it, that this strong, new-built ship in the very launching fell in pieces, and so preserved his dear children there at this present time, from that fatal design."

Ceaseless, ever imminent danger from Episcopal machinations and hatred, and

Thus the spirit of intolerance ever defeated itself. It exiled the Puritans to Holland, where they prayed, and studied the Scriptures undisturbed ; it followed them to Plymouth, and was foiled there ; it planned and planted Massachusetts as a hostile colony, and was foiled there ; it got a commission of more terrible power than ever Islam could endure, and again it was foiled ; then the Pilgrim, turning upon the aggressor, led both bishop and king to their own scaffold, and created the English Commonwealth.¹

The civil war in England grew mainly out of questions of property as between crown and subject. Hampden, imprisoned in 1626 for resistance to the forced loan which Laud taught the "faithful" was rebellion against God, again in 1636 would not pay twenty shillings to the tyrant, Charles Stuart, and by public discussion would rouse the people from apathy

the instinct and duty of self-preservation, fully justified the colonial limitation of the franchise, and we wonder at their moderation in this hour of extreme peril. Mr. Cotton says, the "magistrates, and other members of the Generall Court upon Intelligence of some Episcopall, and malignant practises against the Countrey, they made an order of Court to take tryall of the fidelitie of the People (not by imposing upon them, but) by offering to them an Oath of Fidelitie : that in case any should refuse to take it, they might not betrust them with place of publick charge and command."

What Laud was, what he intended, is disclosed in the following story : "One Price, Superior to the Benedictine monkes, was very familiar, private, and secret with the Archbishop of Canterbury, William Laud." At Rome Laud was "highly praised" by the Jesuites for his "daily demonstrations of his great affection to this our Court and Church ; which he shewed not long since in sending a Common Prayer Booke (which he had composed for the church of *Scotland*), to be first viewed and approved of by our Pope and Cardinals, who perusing it liked it very well for Protestants to be trained in a Form of Prayer and service ; yet considering the State of *Scotland*, and the temper and tenents of that people, the Cardinals (first giving him thanks for his respect and dutiful compliance with them) sent him word that they thought that form of prayer was not fitting for *Scotland*, but would breed some stir and unquietness there." Gage's "*New Survey*," 1648. ch. xxii, fol. 207-209. Jenny Gedde's footstool put an end to that. Rome was more wary than Laud. Was not this Price the "one" who offered the red hat to Laud ?

Cotton's *Answer to Mr. Williams*. 1647. pp. 4. 28, 29.

D'Ewes' *Autobiography*, II, ch. v. p. 118.

¹ Robert Baylie traces "their pedigree in this clear line : Master Robinson did derive his way to his separate congregation at *Leyden* ; a part of them did carry it over to *Plymouth*, in *New-England* ; here Master Cotton did take it up and transmit it from thence to Master Goodwin, who did help to propagate it to sundry others in Old-England first, and after to more in Holland, till now by many hands it is sown thick in divers parts of this kingdom." *Dissuasive*. 1645. p. 54.

to consider their rights and liberties : but when New England introduced, however imperfectly and crudely, a new element, the broader, deeper question, the Rights of Conscience, she ennobled the contest, inasmuch as the Rights of Conscience are higher than the Rights of Property, as man is greater than his possessions, and popularized it, inasmuch as religion was of the many, while property was only of the few. "If a man shall gain the whole world, and lose himself"! Contrast the great-hearted freeman, JOHN CARVER, the first governor of the new Commonwealth, just landed on Plymouth Rock, erect in manhood, with face lifted reverently to heaven, and Buckingham, the consummate courtier of England with his tags and laces : which of the two was the MAN ?¹

" the citizen
You lost for conscience' sake, he was your noblest."

"given back to self-dependence,
Man awakens to the feeling of his worth,
And freedom's proud and lofty virtues blossom."²

It was by the warmth and conviction of this new thought, this belief in man as man, in the Rights of Conscience, that the glorious Commonwealth was achieved.

In the records of the Pilgrims no sentiment is brought into more beautiful relief than their steadfast trust in the providential government of God.³ Humboldt states that the flight of a flock of parrots determined the first colonization of the new world, and the original distribution of the European races on this continent. It guided the Spaniards to the South as the nearest land, thus leaving the North to Germanic and Protestant civilization. Was it accident?

As early as 1578, Halluyt suggested that America might be

¹ Blackstone says, that "the commons were in a state of great ignorance . . . the particular liberty, the natural equality, and personal independence of individuals were little regarded or thought of . . . Our ancestors heard with detestation and horror those sentiments rudely delivered . . . by the violence of a Cade and a Tyler . . . since . . . softened and recommended by the eloquence, the moderation, and the arguments of a Sidney, a Locke, and a Milton." *Commentaries*, iv ch. xxxiii, 433.

² Schiller's *Don Carlos*. Act iii, sc. x.

³ Bradford's *Plymouth*. pp. 26, 38, 41, 67, 78, 80, 99, *et ubique*.

a refuge for the persecuted under religious or political revolutions.¹

In his letter to Mr. Mede, "Newbury, March 2d, 1634," Dr. Twisse says: "Of our English Plantations in the new world—Heretofore I have wondered in my thoughts at the Providence of God concerning that world, not discovered till this old world of ours is almost at an end, and then no footsteps found of the knowledge of the true God, much less of Christ, and then considering our English Plantations of late, and the opinion of many grave Divines concerning the Gospels fleeting westward; sometimes I have had such thoughts, why may not that be the place of New Jerusalem? . . . We have heard lately divers ways that our people there have no hope of the conversion of the natives. And the very week after I received your last Letter, I saw a Letter written from New England discoursing of an impossibility of subsisting there, and seems to prefer the confession of God's truth in any condition here in old England, rather than run over to enjoy their liberty there; yea, and that the Gospel is like to be more deare in New England than in Old": and April 6, 1635, he refers to Lord Say's "counsels for advancing the plantations of the West," and thinks "it may serve as a chamber to hide many of God's children, till the indignation passe over which hastens upon us more and more."²

Was it accident, that with the opening of the struggle between the Crown and the people, between force and conscience, in the time of James,³ the happy voyage of Gosnold in 1602 should revive the spirit of discovery and colonization, and open the refuge for the persecuted? Was it accidental that the New England coast should be reserved for the Pilgrims by the discouragement of colonization growing out of the Popham failure of 1607?

¹ *Voyages*. Lond. 1818. iii, 72.

² Mede's *Diatriba, Epistles*. London, 1652. 547-556.

³ Bradford, 70-80. "May not and ought not the children of these fathers rightly say: Our fathers were Englishmen which came over this great ocean, and were ready to perish in this wilderness; but they cried unto ye Lord, and he heard their voyce and looked on their adversitie, etc. . . . When they wandered in ye deserte wilderness out of ye way, and found no citie to dwell in, both hungrie and thirstie, their sowle was overwhelmed in them."

"There's a divinity that shapes our ends,
Rough hew them how we will."

Was it accident — the falling among "perilous shoals and breakers" — or the caprice of the winds that guided the "May-Flower," and landed the Pilgrims, not in the genial climate south of Cape Cod, but in a higher latitude, on rough coasts, where harsh winters and doubtful harvests favored habits of a provident industry and thrift, the love of an in-door life, of home, and moral and intellectual progress?

Was it accident that despotism compelled Cromwell and his companions to debark from the New England ship and thus forcibly retained the instruments of its own doom?¹ Was it accident that divided the force that was to rescue England from civil and religious thralldom — Cotton and his co-workers in New England — each with its special function and service, but a unit in the common cause of humanity?

Like these was another incident, trivial, except in a comprehensive view of the whole movement: About eighteen miles inland from Boston, the old seaport of Lincolnshire, lies the hamlet of Sempringham, then the seat of the Earl of Lincoln, the fast friend of our John Cotton, vicar of St. Botolph's. It was a day's ride to Sempringham and back to Boston, and three travellers on horseback shortened the time by warm but friendly disputations. Roger Williams, never timid of thought or speech, "presented his argument from Scripture why he durst not joyn with them in their use of Common Prayer." All the answer he received from Master Cotton was that he "selected the good and best prayers in his use of that book," as Sarpi, the historian of the Council of Trent, "was used to do in his using of the masse-book," rejecting what was superstitious;² and Master Thomas Hooker satisfied his heart with

¹ Lord Say; Lord Brooke; Sir Arthur Haselrigge; "Hampden, ashamed of a country for whose rights he had fought alone; Cromwell, panting with energies that he could neither control nor explain, and whose unconquerable fire was still wrapped in smoke to every eye but that of his kinsman, Hampden, were preparing to embark for America, when Laud, for his own and his master's curse, procured an order of council to stop their departure." Hallam's *England*, Ed. 1866, ii, 58. A critical paper on this point in the *N. E. Hist. Gen. Register*, 1866, 113-121. By John Ward Dean.

² *The Bloudy Tenent* in Pub. of Narragansett Club, iii, 69.

no better reason. The appeal was to Scripture and to its sole interpreter, reason. This was the base and logic of independency.

Let us briefly review the lives of those men, and then we may ask, Was there, in all England, anything more pregnant than that day's colloquy on the Sempringham Road? It may be said that Waldo, Wicliffe, Coverdale, Tyndal had scattered the truth all along the centuries. True; but that is vague and general, while here is a definite point of departure, a personality; and the sequence of thought and influence may be traced from that day's converse from mind to mind, gathering force and momentum till it abolished the hierarchy of Anglo-Catholicism, dethroned a tyrant, and established the Commonwealth.

In his paper on the philosophical genius of Bacon and Locke, Sir James Mackintosh says, that "by the Independent divines who were his instructors, our philosopher [John Locke] was taught those principles of religious liberty which they were the first to give to the world"; and, as Lord King counts it "an important fact in the history of toleration that Dr. Owen [the convert and disciple of our John Cotton] was Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, when Locke was admitted a member of that college," "under a fanatical tutor," as Ant6ny Wood calls Owen, so I propose to show, step by step, by exact historical evidence, that the English Commonwealth was the daughter of New England, the reflex of the New on the Old; for ideas control the world and create institutions, while men are merely players. The political ideas of the Pilgrims have penetrated the thought and life of both lands.

Whether we accept Mr. Buckle's theory, that all movements are determined solely by their antecedents, by the force of circumstances, and that if great men had never existed the flow of events would have occurred as it has (and that is but another form of Lord Macaulay's statement, so profusely illustrated in his essay on Dryden, that "it is the age that forms man and not man the age"); or adopt Mr. Carlyle's doctrine, that "the history of what man has accomplished is at bottom the history of great men who have worked here"; or else conclude that the Ruler of events also appoints His agents, and that all

are subordinate to providential designs, — still it gives the charm of life, the zest peculiar to biography, to link ideas and events to personal fortunes. For the lives of great men warm and move mankind far more than the wandering mazes of philosophical speculation ; the drama of life is more attractive than its philosophy. To name Galileo, Bacon, Columbus and Humphrey Gilbert, John Cotton and Henry Vane, Roger Williams and John Milton, Fulton and Morse, Cromwell, Washington, and Lincoln, is to epitomize history. Without names, without biography, history would be lifeless. “ Nations rise and fall by individuals, not numbers, as I think all history proveth,” Thomas Hollis wrote to Dr. Jonathan Mayhew in 1766.

The eldest of the three travellers on the Sempringham Road, of middle age, the eloquent preacher and learned theologian, Mr. John Cotton, was already noted for scholarship, judgment, and oratory, ranking among the ablest ; his correspondence was sought by such thinkers, men of letters, and statesmen, as Archbishop Usher, Lord Say, and others.

The next, Mr. Thomas Hooker, was Mr. Cotton's junior by a year ; educated at Emmanuel College, a man of increasing influence, and while preaching in the neighborhood of London, the trusted friend of the Pilgrims in their troubles with the treacherous Lyford in 1626.

Far the youngest of the three was Mr. Roger Williams, a *protégé* of Sir Edward Coke, whose interest had been early won by the youth's skill in reporting the sayings and doings in the Star Chamber, and to whose liberality Williams owed his education. He took the degree of A. B. at Pembroke College in 1626, and studying awhile with Sir Edward, was grounded in the leading principles of law. Turning to the study of divinity with the ardor which characterized his life, and improving the opportunity on the Sempringham Road to listen to men of such distinction for learning and wisdom as Cotton and Hooker, young Williams pressed home his “ argument from Scripture why he durst not joyn with them in their use of Common Prayer.” Whatever their previous doubtings and scruples had been, the earnest, clear-headed student, fresh in the inquiry, had now brought out the point distinctly, perhaps with legal skill in

statement. They would not evade, they could not answer ; and now what came of it ?

Almost from the time of his going to Boston, July 4, 1612, Mr. Cotton "forbore all the ceremonies alike at once," but by the love and reverence of his people, his eminence, at home and on the continent, as a theologian and preacher, by the influence of great names, he continued "with not a little disturbance from the Commissary Courts" till 1632, when, to avoid prelatic fury and Star-Chamber hangmen, he planned an escape to Holland in disguise. But several of the ablest divines of London, hoping to win Mr. Cotton to conformity and save so great a man to the Church, provided safe retirement for him in and about London.¹ The result of this intellectual tournament and searching debate, during their long conferences, was that Mr. Cotton brought them over to his opinions, and thenceforth they shared with him the obloquy and woes which an angry and powerful hierarchy could inflict, and last, but least of all, exile. Among them, Thomas Goodwin, John Davenport, and Philip Nye were to be his able co-workers in disseminating right opinions in polity, and in fixing the channel of English history.² Fellow-passengers to New England, one in thought and inspiration,

¹ Doubtless this was in mind when Mr. Cotton, in his answer to Mr. Williams, says, "It is well knowne that any stranger in London, by removing now and then his lodging, may escape not only persecution but observation, for a longer time than any of our hearers are ordinarily wont to sojourn there." Mr. Cotton's *Reply to Mr. Williams*. 1647. 141.

² Before Mr. Cotton's departure from *England*, by conferences from *London*, he had brought off Master *Davenport* and Master *Goodwin* from some of the *English* ceremonies ; . . . so soon as he did taste of the *New-English* air, he fell into so passionate an affection with the Religion he found there, . . . had gotten the assistance of Master *Hooker*, Master *Davenport*, and sundry other very worthy ministers, beside many thousands of people . . . being there alone, without any enemy." Mr. Cotton's "convert, Master *Goodwin*, a most fine and dainty Spirit with very little ado, was brought by his Letters from *New England*, to follow him unto this step also of his progresse, and that with so high an estimation of his new Light, that he was bold to boast of it in termes a little beyond the lines of moderation. It had been happy for *England*, that Master *Cotton* had taken longer time for deliberation." Baylie's *Dissuasive*. 1645. pp. 56, 59, 60. Thomas Edwards says, in his *Antapology*, pp. 17-32, that he had "seen and perused the arguments that passed betwixt him [Goodwin] and Master Cotton and some others" ; and "that Master Goodwin was so engaged in his thoughts of one of the ministers of New England, to wit, Master *Cotton*, by whom I am sure he was first taken off, that he hath said there was not such another man in the world again." Where are these manuscript "arguments" ?

Cotton and Hooker will soon reach that higher landing-place to which Roger Williams had challenged them on the Sempringham road. From his native land to the forests of New England, from the groined arches of St. Botolph's to the "mud-wall meeting-house with wooden chalices" of Shawmut, was to John Cotton an escape from the gloomy and stifling crypt to empyrean light, from spiritual thralldom to liberty itself.

Mr. Cotton and Mr. Robinson, the pastor of the Pilgrim Church, had studied at the feet of the same Gamaliel, Robert Parker. From him and Dr. Ames, Robinson early sought counsel and satisfaction in Holland, and Cotton first learned Independency or Congregationalism from his writings, especially his "*De Ecclesiastica Politea*." — "Yea, he proveth it at large," says Cotton. Mather styles Parker "in some sort the father of all non-conformists in that age." He died in 1614, about two years after Cotton became Vicar of St. Botolph's, Boston. Thus it came that in his farewell sermon to his departing friends, Dudley, Winthrop, Bradstreet, and others at Southampton, Mr. Cotton charged them "that they should take advise of them at Plymouth, and should doe nothing to offend them," tidings of which comforted the Pilgrims at Plymouth, who had already found Governor Endecott "a dear friend to us all."¹ Whatever they were while in England, they left no room for doubt after they reached America.

¹ Cotton's *Way Cleared*. 1648. pp. 13, 24; pt. 2d, 12. Trumbull's *Lechford's Plain Dealing*, 185ⁿ. Bradford's *Plymouth*, 279. Scottow's *Narrative*. Brook's *Puritans*, ii, 239. The stigma of semi-separatism rested on the enterprise and its leaders, and the Rev. John White of Dorchester, the father of the enterprise and the correspondent and co-laborer of Roger Conant, the first governor of the Colony, published the *Planter's Plea*, 1630, especially to disprove this charge of "desperate malice," and that the world might be "well-assured" to the contrary, they had made Winthrop governor, because he "was sufficiently knowne . . . where he had long lived . . . as every way regular and conformable in the whole course of his practice" to the established church and religion. Not therefore for exercise or trouble of conscience, but, it appears, for stern prudential reasons, this was to Mr. Winthrop a most welcome opportunity and relief. A lawyer; distressed by the lessening income from the waste of the savings of his grandfather — a thrifty clothier from London — scarcely eked out by a slender and precarious practice; for years past restless and waiting for something to turn up; pressed by the laudable motive daily suggested by *res angusta domi*; married at seventeen; in 1623 wishing "oft God would open a way to settle him in Ireland"; in 1627 resolved to remove to London; in January, 1628, owing more already than

The Christian philosopher, Coleridge, finds that "the average result of the press, from Henry VIII to Charles I, was such a diffusion of religious light, as first redeemed, and afterwards secured this nation [Great Britain] from the spiritual and moral death of popery."¹

In the second part of this glorious work, especially in that relating to *polity*, New England had a controlling share. In about twenty years after the Landing of the Pilgrims, "the Congregational cause," says Dr. Orme, the able biographer of Dr. John Owen, "had obtained a firm footing in New England, and churches were there growing up and flourishing under its auspices. American pamphlets were imported, which disseminated the sentiments of the churches in that quarter. Thus the heresy which had been expelled from England returned with the increased strength of a transatlantic cultivation, and the publications of Cotton, Hooker, Norton, and Mather were circulated throughout England, and, during this writing and disputing period, produced a mighty effect."

he was able to pay without sale of his land, and with children unprovided for; in June, 1629, yet more disheartened by the loss of place as attorney of the Court of Wards, obtained for him a few years before by the influence of his brother Emmanuel Downing of the Inner Temple, — he saw that a crisis was at hand in his own affairs, and was therefore ready for a last cast "in what place or condition soever, in weal or in woe." Then his good genius and ever efficient brother Downing again came to the rescue, turned his thoughts suddenly, and for the first time, to New England, July 28, 1629; he accepted the situation at once, wrote to his son John of his resolve to emigrate, and so with pressing care and sorrow of heart he prepared for the change. To his wife he wrote: "For my care of thee and thine, I will say nothing. The Lord knows my heart, that it was [the] one great motive to draw me into this course. The Lord prosper me in it, as I desire the prosperity of thee and thine." When they reached New England they found the leaders of the forlorn hope, the Colonial Governors, Bradford, Conant, and Endecott (Carver slept in an honored grave), the pioneers who had made the first movements, secured the several charters, instituted civil government, organized churches, imported cattle, cultivated the earth, planted orchards, and perhaps even then in his own thoughts Endecott had reserved "land for a college." Abraham Shurt, "the father of American conveyancing," had been, for years, at the head of the ancient trading post at Pemaquid. Of course, distresses prevailed, but civilization already possessed the land; here was already a *New* England, and to its shores Governor Endecott welcomed the new-comers at Salem, June 12, 1630, where, but two years before, Winthrop was *loath* his son should think of "settling," even as a last alternative. See Winthrop's charming *Domestic Correspondence*, in appendix to *Savage's Winthrop*; and in his *Life and Letters* by Mr. R. C. Winthrop, one of his descendants.

¹ *The Friend*, Essay, ii.

Hume, too, says that the spirit of independency "shone forth in America in its full lustre, and received new accession of strength from the aspiring character of those who, being discontented with the established church and monarchy, had sought for freedom amongst those savage deserts." In the latest thorough study of that decisive period of English history, Dr. Masson also finds its root in the transatlantic world. Dr. Masson says that "the effective mass of English-born independency . . . the New England way . . . lay chiefly, and in most assured completeness, both of bulk and of detail, in the incipient transatlantic Commonwealth of New England . . . self-governed and self-organized as it was. . . . Before the end of 1642 the New England church 'independency' had spoken out her sentiments, in what might be called an authoritative manner, through the most eminent of all her ministers, Mr. John Cotton, of Boston . . . from that moment the exponent of moderate independency whom the Presbyterians felt themselves most bound to answer."¹

Only an examination of the mass of New England learning on the fundamental principles of government,² drawn out by the incessant and impatient demands of English inquiry, can show how emphatically New England became the political seminary for republicanism in Old England. In form the con-

¹ Lord Chatham, in his letter to the king, said, "They left their native land in search of freedom and found it in a desert. Divided as they are into a thousand forms of policy and religion, there is one point in which they all agree: they equally detest the pageantry of a king and the supercilious hypocrisy of a bishop." The Colonists said, "If Parliament could tax us, they could establish the Church of England, with all its creeds, titles, and ceremonies, and prohibit all other churches as conventicles and schism shops." Then came national independence. Antagonism to hierarchal pretence is the key to American history from 1620 to 1783. Appendix to Hume's *Reign of James I.* Thornton's *Pulpit of the American Revolution*, 1860. Masson's *Life of John Milton and History of his Times*. 1871. 543-608. This article was written in 1870, but Dr. Masson's statement carries such weight that I have placed it in the text, rather than in a note, though of later date.

² Nor did they write only on polity. Mr. Baylie's *Dissuasive* elicited from Mr. Cotton this defence of the Congregationalists, or Independents. After stating the facts, Mr. Cotton adds, "Consider whether, among all the servants of Christ now living in any Reformed Churches (put them altogether) they have published so many treatises of the work of conversion as the ministers of this way have done in New England and London." *Way Cleared*. p. 75.

test touched the church only, in fact, the state. Freedom in one begat freedom in the other: "No bishop, no king."¹

Early in 1644, "in the midst of all the high words on both sides," Thomas Goodwin and Philip Nye, two of Mr Cotton's converts to non-conformity and his assiduous correspondents, published, with their commendation "to the reader," his work called *The Keyes*, tending to reconcile some present differences "about government . . . a platform . . . not now new unto our thoughts; yea, it is no other than what our owne apprehensions have been moulded into long since."²

In 1648 Mr. Thomas Goodwin, chief of the independent or "dissenting brethren," in the Westminster Assembly of divines, welcomed with lively satisfaction several able treatises on church polity "now issuing forth, as it were, at once . . . to indicate the truth . . . in these latter days wherein the light and sunshine grow hotter and more intense."³

The treatises which so encouraged Dr. Goodwin were all⁴ written by New England divines, Cotton, Norton, Shepherd, Allen, Mather, and second to none, Hooker; to whose "Survey . . . of the way of the churches of New-England," Mr. Goodwin's preface was dated April 17, 1648. In this Mr.

¹ At Hampton Court Conference, 1604, King James said, "I know what would become of my supremacy; for no Bishop, no King . . . I will make them [the Puritans] conform, or harrie them out of the land — or else do worse!"

² In his *Answer to Dr. Stillingfleet on the Unreasonableness of Separation*, Dr. Owen quotes Mr. Cotton as finding in the writings of Cyprian, "the express and lively lineaments of the very body of Congregational discipline." See also Owen's *Works*. 1852. xiii, 222.

³ Dr. Goodwin left fourteen or fifteen volumes of notes of transactions in the Westminster Assembly. "In 1647, he had invitations from Mr. John Cotton and other worthy ministers, to remove to New England which he was so much inclined to do, as to put a great part of his library on shipboard," but was persuaded to remain in England. Jan. 8, 1649-50, by order of parliament, he was president of Magdalen College, Oxford, with special privileges, and, being in high favor with Cromwell, was one of a Committee of Divines, 1653, to draw up a catalogue of Fundamentals, to be presented to parliament, and a principal man at the Savoy, 1658, framing a confession of faith for the Independent churches. Wilson's *Dissenting Churches*, 1808, i, 217, and *Life of Goodwin*, prefixed to Vol. V of his Works.

⁴ "The point of Schools and Learning . . . divers of them have as good a share in learning as their neighbors. . . . The most of their erudition this day dwells in New England . . . the Magistrates and the whole Land are at their Devotion." Baylie's *Dissuasive*. 640, 129.

Goodwin wishes, rather than hopes, that argument with the Presbyterians may be "a sufficient caveat . . . to the sword's plea or intermeddling, *pendente lite*," . . . he despondingly adds "as yet depending upon another way of trial." His fears were the better prophet; for Charles, the tyrant, whose whole life was a lie, lost his head the next January 30th, and the surgery of the sword, civil war, was the only way by which conscience could throw off the cramp of bigotry.

Of one of these treatises mentioned by Mr. Goodwin, Thomas Fuller, the church historian of England, says, "Of all the authors I have perused concerning the opinions of the Dissenting Brethren (the Independents), none to me was more informative than Mr. John Norton (one of no less learning than modesty), minister in New England, in his answer to Apollonius."¹ This was printed in 1648, with a preface by Cotton, and an address by Thomas Goodwin, Philip Nye, and John Simpson, it being the first Latin volume from New England.² Let it be remembered, the while, that, by the reiterated declaration of her contemporary enemies, these New England doctrines, expounded by New England pens, and illustrated by New England practice, became the political platform in the army and in parliament, and so shaped the history of England.

In 1645 Mr. Robert Baylie,³ the Glasgow minister and one of the ablest in the Presbyterian ranks in the field of controversy, charged Mr. Cotton with being, "if not the author, yet the greatest promoter and patron of Independency . . . a man of very excellent parts . . . of great wit and learning . . . the great instrument of drawing to it not only the thousand of those

¹ In Dr. Allibone's invaluable *Dictionary of Authors*.

² These treatises were often "published" and circulated in manuscript before being printed. For instance: Mr. Cotton's "Discourse," or "Treatise," sent to Archbishop Usher in 1626 at his desire to know what Mr. Cotton "conceived of the way of God's eternal Predestination, and the Execution of it," seems to have been multiplied in manuscript copies, and was "in hands of many," for more than twenty years, and was finally printed, "together with an examination thereof, written by William Twisse, D. D., Pastor of Newbury." London, 1646, pp. vii, 288.8. See Cotton's letter in Parr's *Life of Usher*, reprinted in *N. E. Hist. Gen. Reg.*, 1870. Oct. Twisse's *Epistle unto the Reader*, and marginal note on p. 261. Others of Cotton's books were "published" in manuscript years before they were printed. Dr. Twisse was President of the Westminster Assembly.

³ *Dissuasive*, pp. 56-58, 17, 163.

who left England, but many in Old England, by his letters to his friends," Thomas Goodwin, its apostle there, and to others. Mr. Baylie cites Canne, Barrow, and other advocates of Independency, and speaking of Mr. John Robinson as the "most learned, polished, and modest spirit that that sect ever enjoyed," adds, "The best of the Brownist [or Independent] arguments are brought in the greatest lustre and strength" in Mr. Cotton's work, *The Way of the Churches* . . . "acknowledged by our [Independent] brethren as their judgment," with little dissent or doubt.

But Mr. Cotton himself said, Independency is "of the New Testament . . . of the word of God."¹ This work also won to Independency Dr. John Owen, for which we have his own words as follows : —

"I was then a young man myself, about the age of twenty-six or twenty-seven years. The controversy between Independency and Presbytery was young also, nor, indeed, by me clearly understood, especially as stated on the Congregational side . . . having looked very little farther into those affairs than I was led by an opposition to Episcopacy and ceremonies . . . my acquaintance lay wholly with ministers and people of the Presbyterian way. But sundry books being published on either side, I perused and compared them with the Scriptures and one another, according as I received ability from God. After a general view of them, as was my manner in other controversies, I fixed on one to take under peculiar consideration and examination, which seemed most methodically and strongly to maintain that which was contrary, as I thought, to my present persuasion. This was Mr. Cotton's book *Of the Keyes*. The examination and confutation of which, merely for my own

¹ *Way Cleared*. 1645. 9, 16. "That is ancient which is primitive and to be found in the Scriptures ; neither are the names of these that either have bene of this judgment, or have or doe practise it, of meane and contemptible reputation ; but they have given sufficient testimony to the world of their learning and godlinesse, as learned *Baines, Ames, Cotton*, with the many in these times, both in New England, here and other places, men not a jot behinde any of their Predecessors in the knowledge of the mysteries of the Gospel ; yea, anointed with the gifts of the Spirit above most of their fellows." pp. 22, 23. Henry Burton's "*A Moderate Answer to Mr. Prin's full Reply to certaine Observations on his first Twelve Questions*." London. 1645.

particular satisfaction, with what diligence and sincerity I was able, I engaged in. What progress I made in that undertaking I can manifest unto any by the discourses on that subject and animadversions on that book yet abiding by me. In the pursuit and management of this work, quite beside and contrary to my expectation, at a time wherein I could expect nothing on that account but ruin in this world, without the knowledge or advice of, or conference with any one person of that judgment, I was prevailed on to receive that and those principles to which I had thought to have set myself in opposition. And indeed this way of impartial examining all things by the Word, comparing causes with causes, and things with things, laying aside all prejudicate respects unto persons or present traditions, is a course that I would admonish all to beware of who would avoid the danger of being made Independents." ¹

Dr. Owen classed Cotton with Calvin, Zanchius, Beza, Perkins, Preston, Sibbs, Rogers, and others "whose fame . . . is gone out into all the nations about us, and their remembrance is blessed at home and abroad."

Thus the advanced thought of New England won to the side of popular government John Owen and Thomas Goodwin, whom Antony Wood styled "the Atlases and Patriarchs of Independency." Dr. Owen, chaplain to Fairfax and Cromwell, and preacher to Parliament on great occasions, had a decisive influence with the republican leaders. He was especially intimate with Cromwell, to whom he became personally known after the death of the King. He preached before the House of Commons on the day after the execution of Charles, the tyrant. Vice Chancellor of Oxford when Cromwell was Chancellor, "as much beloved by the Churchmen as by his own party," he promptly declined Clarendon's proffers of immediate preferment. His affinities would lead him to New England. On the death of Mr. Cotton's successor, — the hardly less distinguished Mr. Norton, — Governor Endicott, by appointment of the General Court, Oct. 20, 1663, entreated Mr. Owen ² to become teacher of the church in Boston, nor was the mutual hope

¹ *Owen's Works*. 1654. Ed. 1853. xi, 487. Ormes' *Owen*, 1820: 39, 75, 76.

² A portrait of Dr. Owen prefaces Vol. IV of the 1870 edition of Carlyle's *Cromwell's Letters*, etc.

relinquished for some years; for so late as July, 1656, Mr. Daniel Gookin of Massachusetts, then in England, wrote that Dr. Owen and "some choice ones who intended to come with him are diverted."

"The Great Dissenter" died in 1683, and was laid in his humble grave at Bunhill Fields, "the Puritan Necropolis," followed, says Dr. Allibone, by "more than sixty of the nobility of the realm"; and there he sleeps with John Bunyan, Thomas Goodwin, Isaac Watts, Charles Wesley, George Fox, and others excluded by "the Church" from "Christian" burial in "consecrated" ground — unless their ashes hallow it.

Of Dr. Owen's illustrious disciple, John Locke, Sir James Mackintosh says: "Educated amongst English dissenters during the short period of their political ascendancy, he early imbibed that deep piety and ardent spirit of liberty which characterized that body of men. . . . By the Independent divines who were his instructors, our philosopher was taught those principles of religious liberty which they were the first to disclose to the world"; "which we owe," says Lord King, "not in the least degree to what is called the Church of England. On the contrary, we owe all these to the Independents in the time of the Commonwealth, and to Locke, their most illustrious and enlightened disciple."

Another important fact in the history of the Commonwealth was the residence in New England for some years of Milton's hero,

"Vane, young in years, but in sage counsel old:
 to know
 Both spiritual power and civil, what each means,
 What severs each, thou hast learned, which few have done:
 Therefore on thy firm hand Religion leans
 In peace, and reckons thee her eldest son."

In the family of Mr. Cotton, and admitted to closest intimacy with the great divine in his study, young Vane¹ was there

¹ In his will, Dec. 1652, Mr. Cotton says, "And because yt South part of my house wch Sr Henry Vane built whilst he sojourned with me, He by a deed gave it (at his departure) to my son, Seaborne, I doe, yrfor, leave it unto him as his by right." Quoted in Sibley's *Harvard Graduates*, 1873, p. 286.

Fitly, a legislative committee on the reorganization of the Courts, held its sessions in this Cotton-Vane house in 1804. p. 43, Sullivan's *Address Suffolk Bar*, 1824. Samuel Adams Drake's *Landmarks of Boston*, 1873, 50, 51.

grounded in Scripture principles, and in the storms of bigotry which drove him from Massachusetts received the training peculiarly preparatory to his career as the great leader of the House of Commons against the hosts of intolerance.

So violent were the times that Mr. Roger Williams told Mr. Robert Baylie that he "was employed to buy from the savages, for the late governor [Vane] and Master Cotton with their followers, . . . land without the *English* plantation, where they might retire and live, according to their own minds, exempt from the jurisdiction, civil and ecclesiastick, of all others."¹

But the Ruler of Nations had yet other work for Cotton and Vane and Williams. It is a very probable suggestion that a code of laws² found in Mr. Cotton's study, after his death, "was their joint work."

Mr. Cotton seems to have studied political science from the first. It was the "wisdom of his words and spirit," in a sermon on "Civil Government," that won the fast friendship of the Earl of Dorchester,³ who ever after favored Mr. Cotton in his troubles from prelatie bigotry. His "love followed the young man, Mr. Vane," on his return to England, "and it is well it doth so," said Lord Say and Seal in his correspondence with Cotton.⁴

Governor Vane was ever a magnanimous friend to New England. He emphatically declared "that Misstresse Hutchinson was much mistaken and wronged, that she was a most pious woman, and that her tenets, if well understood, were all true, at least very tolerable";⁵ and certainly Mr. Wheelwright's sermon, which set the colony on fire under the influence of Winthrop, seems harmless enough.⁶ Mr. Vane's letter of June 10, 1645, to Governor Winthrop, "desiring patience and forbearance, one with another . . . though there be difference in opinions," was, says Hutchinson, "in a good spirit, and the

¹ Baylie's *Dissuasive*. 1645. p. 63.

² Dean's *Memoir of Nath. Ward*, Index, *Body of Liberties and Laws of Massachusetts*, where the subject is critically and fully examined.

³ *Life by Norton*. Ed. 1658. p. 18. Sir Dudley Carlton, the able diplomatist and polished statesman, afterward Viscount Dorchester, died 1631. Burke's *Extinct Peerage*, 112.

⁴ Hutchinson's *Hist. of Mass.*, i, p. 66.

⁵ *Dissuasive*, p. 64.

⁶ First published by Mr. Dawson, *Hist. Mag.*, April, 1867.

reproof was decent as well as seasonable." At last reason came; when the magistrates sent for his signature to a paper for the banishment of another minister, the dying Winthrop exclaimed, with remorse, "I have had my hand too much in such things already."¹

Mr. Upham says "of Mrs. Hutchinson, one of the most remarkable persons of her age and sex, learned, accomplished, and of an heroic spirit," that "immediately after her exile from Massachusetts the flood-gates of slander were opened against her. Every species of abuse and defamation was resorted to, and tales of calumny were put into circulation so extravagant, disgusting, loathsome, and shocking, that nothing but the blackest malignity could have fabricated, or the most infuriated and blinded bigotry have credited them." The original source of this offensive matter is Winthrop's *Journal*.

As the prelates, Whitgift and Bancroft, logic failing them, hired the witty Tom Nash to ridicule the Puritans, and as Mr. Wood, in 1634, resented the "many scandalous and false reports upon New England, even from the sulphurous breath of every base ballad-monger,"² so now, when argument failed Rutherford, Baylie, and their fellows, Mr. Winthrop's unfortunate pamphlet about *Antinomians and Familists*³ supplied their batteries with unsavory charges of public and private scandal, of monstrous births and Gorgons dire. Yet not till 1644, seven years after the foul storm of bigotry that well-nigh wrecked the colony,—full time for calmer thoughts,—was this unhappy "*Story*" published in print. Contrast with this Mr. Cotton's spirit and conduct. He said, "Such as endeavored the healing of those distempers did seeme to me to be transported with more jealousies, and heates, and paroxysms of spirit, than would well stand with brotherly love or the rule of the Gospel . . . the bitter fruits whereof doe remaine to this day, in the Letters sent

¹ In Moore's *Materials for American History*, in Dawson's *Historical Magazine*, Jan. 1863. 29. Bishop's *New England Judged*. 1703. 226.

² *N. E. Prospect*. 1634. iv.

³ The later editions were under the title of the *Short Story*. Mr. Savage well says the author's "judgment is so blinded by passion that he seems an unfortunate advocate rather than an impartial reporter." Savage's *Winthrop's Journal*, 1853, I, vi, 284, 293-298, 310-316. *Historical Magazine*. 1857 p. 321, 1858, pp. 22, 170.

over that year, from hence to England . . . Some simple-hearted, honest men, and some truths of God fared the worse."¹

In his dedication of Mr. Cotton's *Gospel Conversion*, 1645 — "To the honorable and true-hearted lover of his country, Sir Henry Vane, junior, Knight, sometime Governor of New England, Treasurer of the Navie Royall, and a member of the House of Commons"—Francis Cornwell says, "You left your native soil in the persecuting times of the prelates, chusing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, according to the light they had received . . . and in that dawning light . . . freed from the yoke of . . . the Bishops that kept you in bondage, you had liberty there to debate those questions which the naming only of them here would have rendered a man odious . . . a thorough Reformation agreeable to the Word of God."

"We claim a right of property in the glory of Sir Henry Vane," says Mr. Upham, in his excellent memoir of that statesman, "because his name is enrolled as a citizen of Massachusetts and adorns the list of her governors, and still more because his whole life was devoted to the illustration and defence of American principles, and finally sacrificed in their cause. . . . In the colony of Massachusetts he had his preparation for the great work of liberty, and had become imbued with the inflexible and stern spirit of freedom and virtue, which, in that early age, as much as at any subsequent period, pervaded New England; and now, on a larger and more conspicuous theatre, he was to unfold and vindicate what are justly termed 'the American principles.'" "They are not kings who sit on thrones, but they who know how to govern."

In the time of Governor Vane's administration, 1636,² Mr. Cotton wrote to Mr. Davenport that the order of the Churches

¹ *The Way . . . Cleared*. 1648. p. 63. Mr. Hutchinson relates (*Hist. of Mass.*, Ed. 1795, i, 165), that "Mr. Cotton upon his death-bed ordered his son to burn all his papers relative to the religious disputes begun in the time of Sir Henry Vane's year. He had bundled them up with an intention to do it himself, but death prevented his going into his study for that purpose. His son [Seaborne] loth to destroy what appeared to him valuable, made a case of conscience to Mr. Norton, whether he was bound to comply. Mr. Norton determined against them."

² His education in Mr. Cotton's study, never forgotten by friend or foe, was often referred to; for instance, in the *Mercurius Aulicus*, Dr. Heylin writes: "It was advertised this day, that on the death of Mr. Hampden [after Charlgrove field, June 24, 1643], whom the lower house had joyned as a coadjutor with the Earle of

and the Commonwealth was now so settled in New England, by common consent, that it brought into his mind the New Heaven and the New Earth wherein dwells Righteousness.¹

Some of the best in the coming Revolution and Commonwealth were openly interested in Puritan New England colonization. Laud was disturbed by "such an universal running to *New England*, and God knows whither; but this it is, when Men think nothing is their advantage but to run from Government."² Yet so still was the work, and so quiet their influence, that the Independents, as a party, were so obscure in 1640 as to escape special mention among the "Anabaptists, Brownists, Separatists, Familists or other sect or sects" in the Episcopal convocation of that June.³ This peace was but the calm before the storm; for the growing unity of the two Englands, and their antagonism too, needed but the opportunity for expression. The lifeless forms and conventionalisms of centuries, the old walls of partition, undermined, gave way before the force of reason and the light of Scripture. The slow current quickened with its volume. England was "at the confluence of two civilizations."⁴ New England formulated the principles which secure freedom and stability without anarchy and despotism.

The keen looker-on and admirable letter-writer, Robert Baillie, notes the progress of Independency; on the 15th March, 1641, he writes, "All the English ministers of Holland who are for [the] New England way, are now here [London]: how

Essex, or rather placed as a superintendent over him, to give them an account of his proceedings, they had made choice of Sir Henry Vane, the younger, to attend that service, *who, having had a good part of his breeding under the holy ministers of New England*, was thought to be provided of sufficient zeale not only to inflame his Excellencie's cold affection, but to kindle a more fiery spirit of rebellion in his wavering souldiers," [quoted in Forster's *Statesmen of the Commonwealth*. Harper's Ed. 1846, 253.]

¹ Mather's *Magnalia*, 1702; Book iii, ch. iv, § 7. *Life of Davenport*.

Letter to Wentworth cited in Forster's *British Statesmen, Life of Pym*. New York, 1846. 161. Strafforde's *Letters*, 1740, ii, 149, 169.

³ The distinction originated in 1612. ii, 49. Hanbury's *Independents*. 1. 2. Dr. Heylin says: "Not long after the beginning of this everlasting Parliament, the *Puritan* faction became subdivided into *Presbyterians* and *Independents*." Dr. Peter Heylin's *Hist. of the Presbyterians*. 1536-1647. Lib. xiii, §§ 45, 61.

⁴ Milton "found himself at the confluence of two civilizations." Taine's *English Lit.*, Book ii, ch. vi, § 1.

strong their party will be here is diversely reported ; they are all in good terms with us Our questions with them of the new way, we hope to get determined to our mutual satisfaction, if we were rid of bishops ; and till then, we have agreed to speak nothing of any thing wherein we differ. Mr. Goodwin, Mr. Hooker, Mr. Baronds, Mr. Simonds . . . all of them are learned, discreet and zealous men. . . . They and we differ . . . in that one thing . . . very small in speculation, yet in practice of very huge consequence, for making *every congregation an absolute and independent church*." Even so, Mr. Baillie. In December preceding "Sey and Brook in the higher house, and these alone, and some leading men in the lower, were suspected by their inclination to the separatists, would divide from the Presbyterians . . . ; but so far as yet can be perceived, that party inclinable to separation will not be considerable ; and whatever it be, these and the rest who are for the Scots discipline, does amicably conspire in one, to overthrow the bishops and ceremonies."

At this critical period influential men solicited Mr. Cotton's return to England, tendering "a ship on purpose to fetch him over,"¹ but instead, Mr. Cotton "transmitted certain of his manuscripts adapted to existing exigences," which were published with the title "The True Constitution of a Particular Visible Church, proved by Scripture. . . . By that Reverend Learned Divine, Mr. John Cotton, B. D., and pastor of Boston in New England. . . . London, 1642";² and *The New England Way* from that moment almost exclusively busied the Presbyterian pens and tacticians, till, says Dr. Heylin, in 1647, "they [the Scots] were stripped of all command by the Independents . . . so easily, with so little noise, that the loss of their exorbitant power did not cost so much as a broken head or a bloody nose."³ So early and effectually had the New England "Commonwealth" reacted on Old England.

"The English were for a civil league, we [the Scots] for a religious covenant," says Baillie in his account of the visit of

¹ Mather's *Magnalia*, Book iii, ch. i, § 23.

² Hanbury's *Historical Memorials*, ii, ch. xliii, 155. This was reprinted "according to a more exact copy," with the title *The Doctrine of the Church*, 1643.

³ *Hist. of the Presbyterians*, 1536-1647. Lib. xiii, § 61. Masson's *Milton and History of his Times*, ii, 598.

the English committee¹ to Scotland for help after the Parliamentary reverses in 1643. "They were, more than we could assent to, for keeping of a door open in England to Independency. Against this we were peremptory." He saw with a prophetic eye. "This seems to be a new period and crisis of the most great affair which these hundred years has exercised the dominions. What shall follow from this new principle, [the New England way of independent self-government] you shall hear as time shall discover." I now quote the memorable words of the House of Commons, March 10, 1642:—

That "the plantations in New England have by the blessing of the Almighty had good and prosperous success without any public² charge to this state, and one now likely to prove very happy for the propagation of the gospel in those parts, and very beneficial and commodious to this kingdom and nation."³

Then came the following eloquent document, memorable in the history of both Englands:—

"The expression of the desires of those honorable and worthy personages of both houses of parliament who call and wish the presence of Mr. Cotton, Mr. Hooker and Mr. Davenport to come over with all possible speed, all or any of them, if all cannot. The condytion whearein the state of things in this kingdom doth now stand wee suppose you have from the relations of others, wheareby you cannot but understand how greate need there is of the healp of prayer and improvement of all good meanes from all parts for the seatlinge and composinge the affaires of the church. Wee therefore present unto you our earnest desires of you all. To shewe whearein or howe many wayes you may be useful would easely bee done by us and fownd by you weare you present with us. In all likely-

¹ On this committee with Sir Henry Vane, "one of the gravest and ablest of that nation," were the ministers Nye and Marshall, and Sir Wm. Armyne, of Osgodby, Lincolnshire, to whom William Wood dedicated his *New Englands Prospect*, 1634. Mr. Wood, the Countess Warwick, Sir Wm. and his lady, Mary, daughter of Henry Talbot, 4th Earl of Shrewsbury, were zealous friends of New England. — Savage's *Winthrop*, ii, 212. *Massachusetts Col. Rec.*, i, 128. *Baillie's Letters*, No. 36. Sir William's baronetcy, Nov. 25, 1619, cost £1095, but he could have bought soon after for £200. — *Cal. State Papers*, 1619-1623. pp. 97, 98, 196, 410.

² "New France was colonized by a government, New England by a people. . . . The French crown founded a State in Canada, a handful of Puritan refugees founded a people in New England."—*The Conquest of Canada*, Harper's Ed., 1850, I, iii, v. So Virginia was colonized by a corporation: but New England, after the happy failure of Popham, 1607, was planted by refugees from the mitre and sceptre, independent in thought and self-reliant in resources.

³ Hutchinson's *Hist. Massachusetts*, 1795, i, 110-112.

hood you will finde opportunity enough to draw forth all that healpefullness that God shall afford by you. And wee doubt not these advantages will be sutch as will fully answer all inconveniences y^oursealves, churches or plantations may sustaine in this your voyage and short absence from them. Onely the sooner you come the bettar.

WARWICK.

W. SAY & SEALE. PH. WHARTON.
MANDEVILLE.

ROB. BROOKE.

| | | |
|------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| NATH. FIENNES. | WM. STRICLAND. | THO. HOYLE. |
| GILBT. GERRARD. | HENRY DARLEY. | COR. HOLLAND. |
| THO. BARRINGTON. | VALENTINE WALTON. | ANTH. STAPLEY. |
| RICHARD BROWNE. | WILLM. CAWLEYS. | HUMFREY SALWAY. |
| HENRY MARTIN. | JOHN GURDON. | WILLIAM HAY. |
| OLIVER CROMWELL. | JOHN BLACKISTON. | J. WASTILL. |
| A. HASELRIG. | GODFREY ROSSEVILLE. | |

WM. MASHAM. H. RUTHIN. GILBERT PICKERING. ALEX. BENCE.
MART. LUMLEY. RO. COOKE. OL. ST. JOHN.
NATH. BARNARDISTON. SAM. LUKE. ISAAC PENNINGTON.
AR. GOODWIN. JOHN FRANCKLYN. MILES CORBETT. WM. SPURSTOWE."

Happily, neither Cotton, Hooker, nor Davenport complied with the request ; for, as Hutchinson, to whom we are indebted for this great state paper, remarks : " Had the churches of New England appeared there by their representatives, or any of the principal divines appeared as members of the [Westminster] assembly, greater exception might have been taken to their building after a model of their own framing." They did better, they sent written "constitutions," and examples of their practical workings.

December 7, 1643, Baillie writes, there are ten or eleven Independents in the Assembly, " many of them very able men," as Goodwin, Nye, Burroughs, Bridges, and others. With Independency " we purpose not to meddle in haste, till it please God to advance our [Scots] army,¹ which we expect will much assist our arguments"! A little later he writes, "The Independent party grows ; but the Anabaptists more ; and the Antino-

¹ *Baillie's* hope was in the army. Jan. 3, 1644, he writes : " Yet we hope in our God that our [Scots] army in England shall break the neck of all these wicked designs." July 8, 1645 : " If our army were in good case, by God's blessing, all would settle quickly in peace." July 15 : " Our army . . . would be a pregnant mean . . . to settle all these dominions according to our mind." With "our army here this last year successful, we should have had few debates." The weakness of our army makes "the sects and their friends bold and very insolent. The King's party here is brought almost to nothing."

mians most. The Independents being most able men, and of great credit, fearing no less than banishment from their native country if presbyteries were erected, are watchful that no conclusions be taken for their prejudice. It was my advice, which Mr. Henderson presently applauded, and gave me thanks for it, to eschew a publick rupture with the Independents, till we were more able for them. . . . We indeed did not much care for delays till the breath of our [Scots] army might blow upon us some more favour and strength." Feb. 18, 1644, "The Independents put out in print, on a sudden, an apologetical narration of their way, which long had lien ready beside them, wherein they petition the Parliament, in a most sly and cunning way, for a toleration, and withal lend too bold wipes to all the Reformed churches, as imperfect yet in their reformation, while their new model be embraced. . . . This piece abruptly they presented to the assembly, giving to every member a copy : also they gave books to some of either House. That same day they invited us, and some principal men of the assembly, to a very great feast, when we had not read their book, so no word of that matter was betwixt us ;" and the excited Baillie exclaims : "God, who overpowers both devils and men, I hope shall turn that engine upon the face of its crafty contrivers, and make it advantageous for our cause."

The full title of this quarto pamphlet is "*An | Apologetical Narration | Humbly Submitted | To the | Honourable Houses | Of Parliament | By | Thomas Goodwin | Phillip Nye | William Bridge | Fer. Burroughs | Sidrach Simpson | London | Printed for Robert Dawlman | M.DC.XL.III.*"

Its authors, "the five dissenters" or Independents of the Assembly, pay this noble tribute to New England : "We had the advantage of all that light which conflicts of our owne Divines (the good old Non-conformists) had struck forth in their times. Last of all we had the recent and later example of the wayes and practices (and those improved to a better edition and greater refinement by all the fore-mentioned helps) of those multitudes of godly men of our own Nation, almost to the number of another Nation [New England] and among them some as holy and judicious Divines as this kingdom hath bred ; whose sincerity in their way hath beene testified before all the world,

and wil be unto all generations to come, by the greatest undertaking (but that of our father *Abraham* out of his own countrey and his seed after him), a transplanting themselves many thousand miles distance and that by sea, into a Wildernes, meerly to worship God more purely, whither to allure them there could be no other invitement."

In 1647 the Independents had help¹ from an unexpected quarter. Soon after the repeal of the Acts of Edward VI and of Elizabeth, abolishing the Book of Common Prayer and substituting the Presbyterian Directory, January, 1645, the Presbyterians got an Act prohibiting the use of the Book of Common Prayer, under penalty of five pounds for the first offence, ten pounds for the second, and a year's imprisonment for the third. The flood of New England influence prevented any severe enforcement of this law, it not being "according to the law of God,"—the limitation which the cautious Sir Henry Vane had put into the Scotch League, as understood by him and the New Englanders,—"according to the Word of God."

Exposed to penalties as an Episcopal Dissenter, under the Presbyterian *Fure Divino*, Mr. Jeremy Taylor² published his *Liberty of Prophesying; showing the unreasonableness of persecuting differing opinions*, in which, as in Chillingworth's

¹ Orme's *Memoirs of Dr. Owen*, pp. 101, 102.

² Coleridge says that as soon as the church gained power Taylor "most basely disclaimed and disavowed the principle of toleration, and apologized for the publication by declaring it to have been a *ruse de guerre*, currying pardon for his past liberality by charging and most probably slandering himself with the guilt of falsehood, treachery, and hypocrisy." (*Literary Remains*, iii, pp. 204, 250, with more quoted in Mr. Caldwell's preface to "*The Bloody Tenent*," *Pub. of Narragansett Club*, iii, xii.) He was the son of a Cambridge barber, and in "splendid alliance" with the throne, having married "Mrs. Bridge," an illegitimate daughter of the "Saint and Martyr" Charles I; in filial duty "chaplain in ordinary" to the king and then chaplain in his army; a favorite of Laud and an enthusiast for monarchy and prelacy: yet after the defeat of royalty and while a prisoner he used the safety bestowed by "the gentleness and mercy of a noble enemy" to write his eloquent *Discourse of the Liberty of Prophesying* (preaching). If we believe his apologist, Antony Wood, he was plied only by personal persuasion "in this great storm which hath dashed the vessel of the [National] Church all in pieces" and by which he lost his "living," when he solemnly declared, "I earnestly contend that another man's opinion shall be no rule to mine." However this may have been, the highest admiration for his genius can only be equalled by our wonder at the facile temper and insensibility of the great preacher who so suddenly and with his grand argument for LIBERTY before him, could utter the servile

great argument,¹ the oracular utterances of the fathers, councils, and popes sink and fade into mere private opinions, leaving the Churches of Canterbury and Rome with a footing as airy as that of the tortoise in Hindoo mythology.

But it is nowhere recorded that after Mr. Taylor was "consecrated" as a bishop "by the grace of God" and of the unclean Charles II, any of the victims under the Act of Uniformity — some of whom found refuge in New England² — ever received from his Lordship a copy of his *Liberty of Prophesying*.

and debasing sentiments in his sermons of January 27, 1660, in the Cathedral Church of Dublin and before the Parliament of Ireland, May 3, 1661. He darkened the light of reason and conscience and bartered his convictions for preferment from the polluted hands of his brother, Charles II, and so became "Jeremy, Bishop, etc." His glory is his shame. The Independent, John Milton, "preferring Queen Truth to King Charles," could say, "I am not one who ever disgraced beauty of sentiment by deformity of conduct, or the maxims of a freeman by the actions of a slave." (*The Second Defence of the People of England*, 1654. *Prose Works*, Bohn's Ed. i, 254.) "Skilful to discern the signs of the times, and eager to improve every opportunity, and to employ all their art and eloquence to extend the prerogative and smooth the approaches of arbitrary power." (Robert Hall's *Christianity consistent with a love of Freedom*. *Miscellaneous Works*, 132, Bohn's Ed. Read Orme's *Memoirs of Owen*, 101-102.)

¹ Chillingworth, "the most exact, the most penetrating, and the most convincing of controversialists, first Protestant, then Catholic, then Protestant again and forever" (Taine's *English Literature*, B. ii, ch. v, § 4) framed his indictment against the Romish Church and its apes, on the principles, though without the name, of Independency. He proves the impossibility of "Succession," of certainty as to a "true priest" or a "true pope." (*Religion of Protestants*, 1637. *Answer to Chap. II*, §§ 63-70, 108, 109, *Answer to Chap. VI*, §§ 39-41.) He ever appeals to Scripture and Reason, thus: "This vain conceit that we can speak of the things of God better than in the words of God; this deifying our own interpretations, and tyrannous enforcing them upon others; this restraining of the Word of God from that latitude and generality, and the understandings of men from that liberty, wherein Christ and the apostles left them; is and hath been the only fountain of all the schisms of the Church, and that which makes them immortal; the common incendiary of Christendom. . . . Take away these walls of separation and all will quickly be one. . . . Let them that in their words disclaim tyranny, disclaim it likewise in their actions . . . and restore Christians to their just and full liberty of captivating their understanding to Scripture only." (*Answer to Chap. IV*, § 16. *Life of Chillingworth* by Maizeaux, 1725, 115, 141).

There can be no better service for Truth than an accessible and attractive edition of Chillingworth; a preface, cross-references, and a thorough index are among the essentials.

² Mather's *Magnalia*, Book iii, *De Viris Illustribus*, "of such ministers as came over to New England after the Re-establishment of the Episcopal Church government in England and the Persecution," etc.

There are considerations ¹ in extenuation of early New England days on this point. For the colonists to admit Laud and his minions to the colonial franchise would have been suicidal, fatal to colonial existence: to exclude them was the only way of safety; and self-preservation is the first law. It is difficult to see how else the dilemma could have been met. The other course would have been to swing wide the gates of the very citadel to the enemy.

Again, not only was religious equality unknown to any code, but tolerance was held to be not only a sin, *per se*, but the prolific mother of all evil, the unchaining of the Evil One. We can hardly conceive at this day of the clear head and steady nerve requisite to the avowal, much more the maintenance, of the then odious doctrine of religious equality. John Robinson and Roger Williams were brave men, and their disciples were heroes. "Not until we have fully reflected upon the action of the Pilgrims," says Mr. Hazewell, "and have compared it with the prevailing sentiment of their age, can we clearly appreciate the distance between their opinions and those of the rest of the world."

We have found that the hostility² to Plymouth Indepen-

¹ Walsh's "*Appeal*," pp. 50, 55, 435. Orme's *Memoir of Dr. John Owen*, pp. 336, 499.

² In Plymouth Colony in 1645, "after court and country had duly thought of it," there was a large majority in both branches of the legislature, "to allow and maintaine full and free tolerance of religion to all men that would preserve the civill peace and submit unto government; and there was no limitation or exception against Turke, Jew, Papist, Arian, Socinian, Nicholaytan, Familist or any other . . . yet notwithstanding it was required, according to order, to be voted . . . the Governor would not suffer it to come to vote, as being that indeed it would eat out the power of godliness . . . and make us odious to all Christian commonweales." This was written as welcome news to John Winthrop of Boston. As the more enlightened magistrate of Plymouth Colony, James Cudworth, some years later phrased the influence of Massachusetts, "Plimoth-Saddle is on the Bay-Horse." That Plymouth retained its love of freedom, appears in the letter of Woodbridge of Killingley, to Richard Baxter, in 1671: "The first members of the Church of Plymouth, the head town from which the whole colony is denominated, were (*as it is possible you have heard*) a swarm of Mr. Robinson's church in Holland. And they have not yet thoroughly grown out of the catachezey that hung about them when they transported themselves into the country. . . . Many of them hold that the civil magistrate has no power in ecclesiastical matters, neither are churches to give accounts to courts, much less to councils, for any irregular proceedings."—*Hutchinson Papers*. Ed. Prince Soc. ii, 172-175. *Bishop's N. E. Judged*. 1703. 160-171.

dency was the germ of Massachusetts, and ought to remember that it was not natural or easy at once to be rid of the habits, prejudices, and spirit of the mother country¹ and of the Old World.

Though in Winthrop's successful state raid on Mrs. Hutchinson's speculative theology, and in the Westminster Assembly, force and numbers were opposed to argument and checked Independency, yet the glorious looking for more light of Robinson and Cotton and Williams was passing into the popular mind, and, says Dr. Orme, "making some allowance on the score of ignorance and early misconduct, it cannot be doubted that to the principles of the Congregationalists, America owes everything she now enjoys of civil and religious liberty. The strength and excellence of their grand principles survived every danger and surmounted every difficulty; they planted the germ of freedom which gradually arrived at maturity, and is now covered with foliage and fruit."²

Pursuing his inquiries further, as I have done, Dr. Orme might and would have added, that England, no less than America, was indebted under God to the teachings and influence of these same New England men for her own political and religious liberty. As good scholars go beyond their teachers, so Vane, Owen, Milton, Cromwell, and other leaders in council and in camp, sometimes lovingly chided New England for her shortcomings and infirmities.

In their compact, 1620, the Pilgrims style themselves "loyal subjects," and so they were, but not according to Anglo-Catholic interpretation of servile obedience, of implicit faith in the "divine right" of kings and of their "creatures" in church and state, nor in passive obedience to lawless will and irresponsible power, such as John Hampden and Algernon Sidney would not endure: they were loyal in all the virtues that pertain to good citizenship; but they knew what belonged to themselves as Christian men, and preferred exile to its loss.

They were Englishmen,³ "resolved not to lose their names

¹ So late as 1813, excommunication from the Anglo-Catholic Church disqualified as juror, witness, or for any act "to be done by one that is '*probus et legalis homo*.'" Act 53, Geo. III, 1813, in Trumbull's *Lechford*. Note 33.

² *Memoirs of Owen*. 499.

³ Winslow's "*Hypocrisy Unmasked*," 88.

and nationality"; they loved England, "our Honorable nation of England," but truth and manhood more.

"There was no corner of the globe," exclaimed Chatham in Parliament, May 26, 1774, to which "the ancestors of our fellow-subjects in America would not fly with alacrity, rather than submit to the slavish and tyrannical spirit which prevailed at that period in their native country."

Refused the royal seal, and to that extent thrust out of the national protection and thrown upon their natural rights beyond the realm,—typical of the political philosophy of America,—and 3,000 miles across the seas, the Pilgrims, with Christ's Gospel their only and sufficient charter, in wintry want and sickness "bègune some small cottages for their habitation; as time would admitte, they mette and consulted of lawes & orders, both for their civill & military Governmente, as y^e necessitie of their condition did require, still adding therunto as urgent occasion in several times, and as cases did require," negotiated written treaties with their neighbors, as an independent nation, and thus sprang into existence a "body politic," with the elements of nationality, and its functions in healthy action, based upon a system of justice and equality yet unknown in the Old World.¹

In his letter to the Countess of Lincoln, in 1631, Governor Dudley wrote of them: "After much sickness, famine, poverty, and great mortality (through all which God, by an unwonted Providence, hath carried them) they are now grown upp to a people healthful, wealthy, politique, and religious."²

The successful experiment became a precedent, and roused dissatisfied England, generated new hope and that noble em-

¹ "Neither Patroons, Lords nor Princes are known there; [in New England] only the People. Each Governor is like a Sovereign in his place, but comports himself most discreetly. They are, and are esteemed, Governors next to God by the people, so long as the latter please . . . the People have a new election every year, and have power to make a change and they would make a change in case of improper behavior." — *Petition of the Commonalty of New Netherlands to the States General*, July 26, 1649. *Documents Col. Hist. of New York*, i, 266. "Deane's Bradford, 90.

² The Countess of Lincoln, Bridgett, daughter of William Fiennes, created Viscount Say and Sele, July 7, 1624, and wife of Theophilus Clinton, Earl of Lincoln; her brother, Nath'l Fiennes, was Colonel in the Parl. Army. — *New Hampshire Hist. Coll.* iv, 224, and in Force's *Hist. Tracts. Magnalia*. Book iii, 135, § 6.

ulation that led to other free states, each ultimately a sanctuary for that Berean liberty which, under God, is the vindicator of Truth and Right.

Mr. John Davenport,¹ one of Mr. Cotton's converts in the London Conference, — one whose charity-money for the ministry to the poor and destitute had been confiscated by Laud, as prejudicial to the spread of Anglo-Catholicism, and also as without royal or episcopal license, — with his friends Stephen Goodyear and Theophilus Eaton, established the Republic of New Haven. "My arm shall reach him there!" exclaimed the angry Laud, when he heard of Mr. Davenport's escape to New England. Of the principles of the Republic of Rhode Island, which came into being as a place of refuge in Winthrop's time, Gervinus says, in his *Introduction to the History of the Nineteenth Century*, "They have given laws to one quarter of the globe, and, dreaded for their moral influence, they stand in the background of every democratic struggle in Europe."

Mr. Thomas Hooker, one of the Sempringham travellers, who in Holland aided the famous Dr. Ames in his *Fresh Suit against the Ceremonies*, yielded to Mr. Cotton's suggestion, and, narrowly escaping the hierarchal pursuivants, they became fellow-voyagers to New England. Mather calls them "The Luther and Melancthon of New England."² And here Mr. Hooker founded the Republic of Connecticut. He was also a leader in forming the confederation of the colonies.³

Thus within twenty or twenty-five years from 1620, England witnessed the fact of independent commonwealths, sovereignties in fact, in a league offensive and defensive, "by the name of *The United Colonies of New England*" (May 19, 1643), the model and prototype of the Confederacy of 1774. A combination of free states, an international league, and no

¹ Neal's *History of the Puritans*, Choules' Ed. 298, 299, 306, 308; Masson's *Milton and his Times*, Boston Ed. i, 287, 296; Bacon's *Hist. Disc.* 85; Brook's *Puritans*, iii, 449; Mather's *Magnalia*, 1702. Book iii, chap. i, § 18, chap. iv, § 4.

² Mather's *Magnalia*, B. iii, 57-68.

³ In reference to this, Mr. Hooker wrote sharply to Mr. Winthrop in 1638, that his conceit "to refer the decision of a civil question or controversy to whole churches cannot be safe, nor warranted by any rule as you conceive." Found by Mr. Trumbull among the *State Papers of Massachusetts*, and published in the *Connecticut Hist. Coll.* i, 10.

king! A parliament without a mace, a church without a mitre, lands without manorial lords. "Bishop" Morell had left in despair as long ago as 1623;¹ the arm of even a Laud was paralyzed in its reach thither;² feudalism in Maine was smothering in its own weakness; and the vigor of this Commonwealth had been equal to the severe strain of the civil commotion excited by Winthrop's bigotry and jealousy³ in 1637, — the great blot in the fair record of general welfare.

And all this was the work of exiles from oppression in England, to whom the tyrant's High Commission and Star Chamber was but a way to the pillory, the dungeon, or the fagot. New England's practical success in self-government and New England thought reacted with profound effect upon the mother country. England saw the facts, and, in her agony, looked thither for counsel,⁴ got it, and followed it, till she too had a Commonwealth.

Mr. Masson's reflections on this colonial confederation are much to our purpose, and of great weight, being given after a careful review of the literature of the period; he says: —

¹ 1623, Gorges "brought over . . . one Mr. Morell, who . . . had . . . power and authority of superintendencie over other churches granted him, and sundrie instructions for that end; but he never shewed it, or made any use of it (it should seeme he saw it was in vaine); he only speake of it to some hear at his going away." — Bradford's *Plymouth*, 154.

² In his paper on the *Records of Massachusetts under its First Charter*, p. 21, Mr. Upham quotes Collier's *Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain*, that while Archbishop Laud's Order in Council, June 17, 1634, enjoining the establishment of the National Church was generally obeyed, "New England was somewhat of an exception. The Dissenters who transported themselves thither established their own fancy," — rather than Laud's. The story of the Episcopal machinations against New England (Hubbard's *History of New England*, 261–273, with Savage's *Winthrop*, 2d Ed. i, 312, 320, 332, 333, 338, 358, 367) and Scotland equals a game at chess in interest. New England made the last move in the game, — *Schachtmatt!* the king is dead, at the hands of the Independents, Republicans.

³ In his admirable *Life of Sir Henry Vane* (very freely used in Mr. Forster's *Statesmen of the Commonwealth*, says Mr. Edward Everett in *The National Intelligencer*, September 25, 1838), Mr. Upham says that "jealousy and prejudice" organized the opposition to Vane (107, 108), that in its first open manifestation "it is impossible not to recognize a more liberal and enlightened spirit in Vane and Dudley than was manifested by the other members of the court" (117). "With the support of Governor Vane and John Cotton, Mrs. Hutchinson was, for a time, enabled to protect herself against the persecution with which she was threatened in consequence of her theological sentiments. Winthrop . . . led the opposition" (142, 143, 159, 160).

⁴ See pages 3, 4.

"An important change in the political system of the New England colonies was accomplished in May 1643, only a week or two before the convention of the Westminster Assembly. This event, the news of which must have reached England just as the Assembly was beginning its work, does not seem to have excited much attention. Yet not only was it the first step towards the formation of the future Republic of the United States, but even on the English Church questions, which the Westminster Assembly had been called to debate, it was not to be without some immediate bearing. The sudden stoppage of the immigration from England, and the commencement even of a return-wave, had strengthened in the New Englanders the sense that they were in fact a distinct commonwealth, depending on themselves for their future, and bound to look after that future [as they ever had done] by wise provisions."¹

When such statesmen as Henry Vane, Oliver St. John, and Oliver Cromwell, the immediate successors of Hampden and Pym, and the strong men of New England, like Cotton, Hooker, and Davenport, animated with one principle and one hope, were leagued against the common enemy—then the days of absolutism and irresponsible government were numbered. The Revolutions of 1689 and 1776 must follow.

Though remote from the great world in the forests of New England, Cotton and his brethren rendered greater service to the good cause than personal presence could afford, for from their studies went forth "words as a live coal to the hearts of many," the great principles and arguments which fixed the course of things, and which Fairfax and Cromwell vindicated in the field. The pen moved the sword, and united they won liberty for the world.

The little that is left of the private correspondence between Hooker, Cotton, and Cromwell affords a glimpse of the goodly fellowship between New and Old England as the glorious work went on. After a careful review of events in his letter to Cromwell, "28th of 6th, 1651," Mr. Cotton says, "These things are so cleare to mine owne apprehension, that I am fully satisfied that you have all this while fought the Lord's battells, and the Lord hath owned you, and honoured himselfe in you in all your expeditions, which maketh my poor prayers the more serious and faithful and affectionate (as God helpeth) in your behalfe. In like frame (as I conceive) are the spirits

¹ Masson's *Life of John Milton and History of His Time*, ii, 598.

of our brethren (the elders and churches of these parts) carried forth, and the Lord accept us, and help you in Christ. . . . As for the aspersion of factious men, I hear, by Mr. Desborough's letter last night, that you have well vindicated yoursele therefrom by cashiering sundry corrupt spirits out of the army. And truly, Sir, better a few and faithfull, than many and unsound. The army on Christ's side (which he maketh victorious) are called chosen and faithfull, Rev. 17. 14, a verse worthy your Lordship's frequent and deepe meditation." ¹

And Cromwell, enclosing to Cotton, in a letter of Oct. 2, 1651, a narrative of the defeat of the Scotch invaders, exclaims, "How shall we behave ourselves after such mercy? What is the Lord a-doing? What Prophecies are now fulfilling? Who is a God like ours? To know His will, to do His will are both of Him. I took this liberty from business, to salute you thus in a word. Truly I am ready to serve you and the rest of our Brethren and the Churches," and concludes, "Pray for me. Salute all Christian friends though unknown. I rest your affectionate friend to serve you,

"OLIVER CROMWELL."

About the same time Nathaniel Mather wrote from England, "T is incredible what an advantage to preferment it is to have been a New Englishman."

"It is certain," says Mr. Hallam in his *Constitutional History of England*, "that the congregational scheme leads to toleration"; ² but the spirit of Independency, intolerant of all oppression, diffused itself through the whole body of affairs, and showed itself impatient of civil wrongs, though hoary with age, and of oppressions and inconveniences, though so long endured and so venerable for their antiquity that custom had even endeared them. The legislators of 1641 struck at all courts which had become odious or burdensome. The

¹ *Hutchinson Papers*, Pub. Prince Society, i, 262-267. Carlyle's *Cromwell's Letters*, clxxxiv. John Desborough married Cromwell's sister. Is his letter to Cotton lost? The allusions and references in this letter are fully elucidated by Mr. Carlyle.

² Murray's Ed. 1855, ii, 202. Dr. Adam Smith regards the Independent polity as "productive of the most philosophical good temper and moderation with regard to every sort of religious principle."

Star Chamber, Requests, High Commission, the ecclesiastical Courts, the Councils of Wales and of the North fell before them; and great was the wrath thereat. The Presbyterian Edwards¹ denounces the sectaries [Independents] as "guilty of insufferable Insolencies, horrible affronts to authority, and of strange outrages against . . . the Common Law as coming from the Devill, . . . in divers pamphlets within these last two years," and cites in proof *A Remonstrance to their owne House of Commons*, in which they say, "The greatest mischief of all, and the oppressive bondage of England . . . an unfathomable gulf, is the Law practices in Westminster Hall; . . . there is neither end nor bottom of them, so many uncertainties, formalities, punctilios, and what is worse . . . all the entries and proceedings in . . . language not one of a thousand of my native countrymen understand. . . . The King's Writ that summons a parliament, implying the establishment of religion, shows that we remain under the Norman yoke of an unlawful power from which we ought to free ourselves. Ye know the laws of this nation are unworthy a free people, and deserve from first to last to be considered, and reduced to an agreement with common equity and right reason, which ought to be the form and life of every Government." "'T is evident," says Edwards, "the sectaries aim at a total change of the lawes and customs of this kingdom . . . yea, they have pleaded for the King to be deposed and justice to be done upon him as the grand murtherer of England . . . and monarchie turned into a democracie."²

¹ *Gangraena*, 1646, 194. Thomas Edwards, an Episcopal clergyman, and next a Presbyterian, bitterly opposed the Independents and wrote a *Treatise against Toleration* . . . *the last and strongest hold of Satan*, 1647.

Another, Dr. John Bastwick, a captain in the Presbyterian army, who had been released by Parliament from perpetual imprisonment and a fine of £5,000, Laud's Star-Chamber punishment for opposing the Anglo-Catholic Claim of *Jure Divino*,—(his ears, clipped by the Apostolic Laud, could not be repaired), in 1646 denounced "Independency as not God's ordinance . . . brought out from Holland and New England . . . darkening truth and disorganizing all things."

² "A chaos of Anarchy, Libertinism, and popular confusion . . . now covereth the face of this kingdome, . . . wherein all errors and sects cover their heads under the catholic Buckler of *Independency*, . . . which all men in all Societies naturally love and seek after." — *Sermon before the House of Lords*, 28 May, 1645, for solemn and publick Humiliation. By Alexander Henderson, minister at Edinburgh.

Mr. Peters was early and earnest for this Reformation, suggested many of the most important reforms, and Cromwell promoted it. In 1651, December 30, Parliament appointed a Committee to consider and present to the House the names of fit persons out of the House to consider the inconveniences, delays, charges, and irregularities in proceedings at law, and "the speediest way to reform the same"; and on the 20th of January they reported the names of twenty-one, of whom Mr. [Matthew] Hale was the first named, Sir Henry Blunt, Major General Desborough, Mr. Hugh Peters, Mr. Rushworth, Sparrow, and Sir Antony Ashley Cooper, afterwards Lord Shaftsbury, was the last. The main points in their Report related to marriage before magistrates, County Registry of Deeds, wills and administrations, parish registry of births, marriages, and deaths, local, elective magistracy and tables of legal fees. All this had been done in New England from the outset, and by declaratory statutes in Massachusetts in 1639 and 1640, with the exception of marriage; for it was said "to raise up laws by practice and custom had been no transgression [of our colonial charter] as in our church discipline, and in matters of marriage. To make a law that marriages should not be solemnized by ministers is repugnant to the laws of England; but to bring it to a custom by practice for the magistrates to perform it, is no law made repugnant," etc.¹

New England was distinctively the leader in this Law Reform and its regenerating influence. In his essay before the Juridical Society, *Anticipations under the Commonwealth of Changes in the Law*, Mr. Robinson says, "The goodness of the laws of Charles II [of the Commonwealth], contrasted with the badness of his government, has drawn a compliment from Blackstone, epigrams from Burke and Fox, and a paradox from Buckle. An inquiry into the source of these laws may show that the paradox is unreal, the epigrams unfounded, the compliment due to the Republicans; that they, in redressing

¹ Whitelock's *Memorials*, 519, 520. *Somers' Tracts*, vi, 177-245. *Plymouth Col. Records*; *Massachusetts Col. Rec.*, Sept. 9, 1630, Oct. 7, 1640. Winthrop's *Journal*, 1639; i, 389, quoted in Dean's *Memoir of Nathaniel Ward*, 1868, ch. v. Burton's *Diary*, 1657-8. Note. Peter's *Last Legacy to his Daughter*. London, 1660. Boston, 1717, 83-85.

grievances which from the time of James and Bacon had been fostering rebellion, forestalled the law-reformers, not of the Restoration only, but of our own age." The tribute is due to New England ; for as early as 1636, May 25, Massachusetts appointed Henry Vane, John Winthrop, Thomas Dudley, John Haynes, and Richard Bellingham, civilians, John Cotton, Hugh Peters, and Thomas Shepard, ministers, a committee " to make a draught of laws agreeable to the Word of God, which may be the Fundamentalls of this Commonwealth." Mr. Cotton prepared " a body of fundamentalls according to the judicial laws of the Jews," submitted to the General Court in the next October. This was published in London in 1641, under the title of *An Abstract of Lawes of New England as they are now established*, possibly¹ by Thomas Lechford, of Clements Inne, who, with Hugh Peter, had just returned from New England, whither he had retired for about four years after the hazardous service as solicitor for Prynne in his trial before the Star Chamber for publishing his *Histrion-Mastix*, 1633, a "libel" on Laud's ritualistic superstitions and High Church innovations. Soon after, early in 1642, Lechford published further *Newes from New England*. "A short view of New England's present government, both ecclesiastical and civil, compared with the anciently received and established government of England in some material points fit for the gravest consideration in these times." Mr. Cotton's "modell" was republished in 1655 as "an abstract of Laws and Government, wherein, as in a mirrour, may be seen the wisdom and perfection of the government of Christ's Kingdome. Accomodable to any State or form of government in the world, that is not Anti Christian or Tyrannicall."

"It is fit," said Sir Antony Ashley Cooper, "that laws should be plain for the people," and not in the barbarous jargon of the Reports and Year Books ; and the Independent advocate, John Coke, Solicitor General at Charles' trial, would retain nothing, "either properly or directly or collaterally and obliquely repugnant to the lawes of God," — "a method which," says Mr. Robinson, "had been pursued in the Judaized code of

¹ But more likely by some friend in England.

New England," and he admits that "even then English Puritanism looked to America." Lechford's *Newes from New England*" was much in the hands of the Republican jurists. It is cited in *Examen legum Angl.* 1656, and often referred to.¹

Two centuries have gone by, and Lord Campbell, Chief Justice of the King's Bench, says, "We ought to be grateful to the enlightened men who then flourished, for they accomplished much, . . . the wise civil measures of the Commonwealth, . . . showed a sound knowledge of the principles of government. . . . Almost the whole of the Commonwealth law reforms have been gradually introduced into our system"; but among the exceptions is that "for establishing a registry for all deeds affecting real property; . . . the greatest and most beneficent of all still remains to confer glory upon the honest and vigorous administration that shall carry it through." This was peculiarly a New England idea.² Lord Campbell adds: "The people should be taught habitually to do honor to the memory of those by whose wisdom and patriotism such blessings had been achieved, . . . and which if they had been properly appreciated and supported would have conferred unspeakable benefits on the country, anticipating and going beyond most of the salutary amendments which have been adopted in the reigns of William IV and Queen Victoria."³

The late Prescott Hall declared that "the known defects in the laws and practice of England, pointed out and most strikingly stated by Lord Brougham in his great speech upon Law Reforms, delivered in the House of Commons in 1828, were discovered and banished from the New England States while they were yet colonies under the British Crown."⁴

¹ *Massachusetts Colonial Records, sub anno.* Trumbull's admirable edition of Lechford's *Plaine Dealing*, 1867. *Introduction*, xxxvi, 64, note 91. *Papers of the Juridical Society.* London, 1871, 567, 589²-601. Among the chief characters in Flatman's *Don Juan Lamberto*; or, *a Comical History of the Late Times*, by "Montelion, Knight of the Oracle," in Somers' *Tracts of the Commonwealth*, vii, 104-155, are "the Arch-Priest Hugo Petros," "Sir Vane, Knight of the mystical Allegories . . . in Nova Anglia," and "Seer [John] Cotton."

² In his *Good Work for a Good Magistrate*, Mr. Peters suggests a Registry in every parish, whereby every man may know and enjoy his own whilst he lives, and be sure his will should be performed when he is dead."—Rev. Dr. Felt's *elaborate Memoir of Peters in the New England Hist. and Gen. Reg.*, 1851, 231, 275, 415.

³ Campbell's *Lord Chan.*, iii, pp. 91, 94.

⁴ Letter to the author from George H. Moore, LL. D., of the New York Historical

But we must leave this attractive inquiry, fitter for a volume than a page, with the emphatic declaration of one whose opinion is authoritative in this department: "Certainly," says Dr. George H. Moore, of New York, "Massachusetts has given the law to the United States more literally than either her friends or enemies have ever cared to claim or acknowledge; and the diligent student of legal antiquities may recognize in her earliest codes the expression of principles of reformation which have since pervaded the whole realm of English law."

But not only did New England suggest these beneficent law reforms, but through Sir Geo. Downing she also initiated the system of commercial policy contained in the Navigation Act of Oct. 9, 1651, which "raised the British naval and colonial power, in no very long period, from inconsiderable beginnings to an unparalleled state of grandeur and power, and laid the foundation for the inevitable spread of the British race and *language* through every quarter of the habitable globe"; "perhaps the wisest of all the commercial regulations of England," says Adam Smith; and Mr. Upham regards it not only as the wisest but as "the boldest, it might almost be said, the most high-handed, legislative proceeding ever passed. It is easier to change the dynasty than it is to change the business of a country. England was fast sinking, and soon would have sunk to rise no more. A strong and violent remedy was needed and it was applied. The nation was shaken and convulsed, but was at last rescued by the operation." The son of Emanuel Downing of the Inner Temple, early in New England, George's "early youth," says Mr. Upham, "had been passed on the seaboard of New-England, where the spirit of enterprise and trade had from the beginning found its most genial home. His mind was formed and his genius shaped in Salem, where commerce and navigation were then, as they have ever since been, the chief topics of interest among the people. Hugh Peters was his kinsman, pastor, and instructor, at the very time when that enlightened statesman was laying the foundations of

Society, October 25, 1870. See also Sir Geo. Bowyer, Bart, D. C. L., on *Reform of the Law of Real Property* in *Papers of the Juridical Society*, London, 1871, Part XIV, and in the same volume Mr. Robinson's *Anticipations under the Commonwealth of Changes in the Law*, Part XV.

American navigation and commerce, and revealing to the colonists the relations, and circulations, and mysteries of the coasting and foreign trade, and pointing out to them the value of the fisheries, as contributing to the mercantile and naval strength of a people. . . . As citizens of the new world, we may take a natural and reasonable satisfaction in the thought, that the genius which put forth this mighty energy was kindled by a spark struck out in our American wilderness, and that Old England was rescued from destruction, and placed in the path to power and glory, by one who was reared under a New England education, and sent forth among the first fruits of our most ancient college. . . . Surely, the credit of the profoundest statesmanship must be ascribed to those who, before it began, were able so wisely to devise the means of *preparing* for it.”¹

England is indebted to Sir George Downing also for the plan of specific parliamentary appropriations, Oct. 21, 1665, the principle by which the Commons of England hold the purse-strings, control the executive, and practically rule England. Sir George first secured and then held the King's approval against the influence and argument of his chief advisers that it was an encroachment on the royal prerogative. Hallam says, “It drew with it the necessity of estimates regularly laid before the House of Commons; and by exposing the management of the public revenues, has given to Parliament, not only a real and effective control over an essential branch of the executive administration, but, in some measure, rendered them partakers in it.”² Sir George had brought the idea from New England; it was the custom there.

New England gave to the cause of progress and the Commonwealth in England that consummate man of affairs, the capacious, resolute, honest, benevolent Hugh Peters, “a man con-

¹ *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, Sept. 1838, p. 318, cited in the Hon. Charles W. Upham's able and conclusive historical investigation as to the authorship of the British Navigation Act, in Hunt's *Merchant's Magazine*, May, 1841, 413, *406, 408, 411, 405. It was the work of our Sir George Downing.

² Memoir in MS. of Sir George Downing, by John P. Prendergast, Esq., of Dublin, my obliging correspondent; Christie's *Life of Shaftesbury*, 1871, i, 289-291. Hallam's *Constitutional Hist. of Eng.*, Murray, 1855, ii, 356, 357.

cerning whom we have heard so many falsehoods,"¹ says Mr. Carlyle, and whose career — from the time of his imprisonment by Laud, and exile to Holland, "only for praying at Sepulchre's Church for Queen Henrietta's conversion to Protestantism,"² till he gave his life in 1662, on the same scaffold with Sir Henry Vane, for the same cause, and with equal soul — is of itself an index to the times.

"Souls leaped to heaven from scaffolds gory!
They passed, nor saw the work they wrought."

Educated at Cambridge, subscribing to Conformity, August 17, 1627, early led by John Cotton to Non-conformity and Independency,³ honored and trusted by the wisest and best in every rank, an aggressive man, a leader, ever in the front, potent in council, in the army, in parliament, in the pulpit and with the pen, preferred to delicate and important negotiations, confided in even by Charles Stuart, aptly styled by Prynne, "the Solicitor-General of the Independent Cause and Party" — Hugh Peters⁴ was a true reflex of New England on the mother country, and second to none of the patriots in the vigorous assertion and defence of their great principles. He was an efficient man. In Holland he collected £30,000 for suffering Protestants in Ireland. In New England he led the way in enterprise. From his going to England in 1642 at the "public request" of Connecticut and Massachusetts, with Mr. Thomas Welde of Roxbury as his associate for Massachusetts, his name constantly occurs in the publications of the time, loved by friends and hated by foes. Dr. Masson says, "There arrived Hugh Peters, Thomas Welde, and others, as the accredited ambassadors of the Independency of New England. This thickened the controversy; and accordingly, through the rest of 1641,

¹ Carlyle's *Cromwell*, ed. 1870, i, 217, 244, 247, 299; ii, 4, 154; iii, 183.

² Prynne's "*Breviate*" of Laud, 1644, p. 421.

³ "Master Peters, the first planter of that weed [Independency, the New England way] at Rotterdam . . . which it seemeth he also learned by Master Cotton's Letters from New England." — Baylie's *Dissuasive from the Errors of the Time*, 1645, 75.

⁴ Dr. Masson's *Life and Times of John Milton*, 1871, ii, 543-608, classifies seventeen New England men potent in that period. Rev. Dr. Felt's *Memoir of Peters* in the *N. E. Hist., Gen. Reg.*, 1855, 236; Felt's *Ecclesiastical Hist. of New Eng.*, 1855, i, 428-434, 443.

there is evidence of a growing fear, on the part of the English Presbyterians, of the chances of some success for 'Congregationalism,' or 'Brownism,' or 'The New England Way.' Presbyterianism availed itself of all its existing resources of reply, and set new pens to work."¹

The feeling between the two Englands appears in a sermon: "New | Englands | Teares | for old | Englands Feares. | Preached in a sermon on July 23, | 1640, being a day of Publike Humiliation, | appointed by the Churches in behalf of our | native Countrey in time of | feared dangers. | By WILLIAM HOOKE, Minister of Gods | Word ; sometimes of *Axmouth* in *Devonshire*, | now of *Taunton*, in *New England*. | Sent over to a worthy member of the honourable | House of Commons, who desires it may be for | publike good. | London | . . . | 1641."

"There is no Land that claimes our name, but *England*, wee are distinguished from all the Nations in the World by the name of *English*. . . . And how have they alwayes listened after our welfare, ebbing and flowing in their affections with us? How doe they (I meane all this while, multitudes of well-affected persons there) talke of *New-England* with delight! How much nearer Heaven doe some of their charities account this Land, then any other place they heare of in the world? Such is their good opinion of us! How have some among them desired to dye, if they might not be vouchsafed to live in this Land? And when sometimes a *New-England* man returnes thither, how is he lookt upon, lookt after, received, entertained, the ground he walks upon beloved for his sake, and the house held the better where hee is? how are his words listened to, laid up, and related frequently when hee is gone? neither is any love or kindnesse held too much for such a man."²

Another London pamphlet of 1645, showed "New-Englands Sence | of Old England | and Irelands | sorrowes. | A Sermon Preached upon a day of | general Humiliation in the Churches

¹ Masson's *Milton and his Times*, ii, 593.

² Mr. Hooke, born at Southampton, 1601, was of Trinity College, Oxford; B. A., 1620, M. A., 1623; near of kin to Whalley and Goffe, the tyrannicides, and to Cromwell, on his return to England in 1656, and as domestic chaplain and confidant of the Protector, he was associated with John Owen and John Milton. — *The Ministry of Taunton*, by Samuel Hopkins Emery, Pastor of one of its churches. 1853, i, 63-73, 92, 96.

of New-England. In the behalfe of Old Englands and Irelands Sad condition." By Mr. Hooke of Taunton. "Intrusted in the hands of a worthy Member of the Honorable House of Commons, who desired it might be printed." He exhorts to "uniting the hearts of all the Churches in this Land to one another, and all of them this day to our deare Countrey, in opposing the common Adversary. For what hath *England* said to us of late? *If the Papists, Prelates, and Atheists be too strong for us, then you shall help us; and if at any time the enemy be too strong for you, we will help you.* O let us all enter into Covenant with *England*. . . . Beloved! Christ is this day sensible of all the abuses that have been offered by the Prelates to his messengers. How often hath he cried from heaven, if that poore soule had not been utterly deafe, *Laud, Laud, why persecutest thou me? It is hard for thee to kicke against the pricks.*"

Archbishop Laud's hatred of Cotton, Hooker, Peter, Davenport, and other chief men of New England, and his personal dread of New England ideas, instigated him to continual plottings against the peace and safety of the colonies, especially of Massachusetts. But New England relieved herself of these unwelcome visitations by assuming the offensive against the Episcopal "throne" at home.

There was a grim humor in New England's pressing invitation to Archbishop Laud to visit, in New England, his absent friends, whose presence he had so often desired in England. We have the story from the prelate's own diary of March 24, 1643, that he had heard of "a plot to send me and Bishop Wren¹ to New England within fourteen days. Mr. [Thomas] Weld, a minister that came hence offered wagers of it . . . April 25, Tuesday. It was moved in the House of Commons to send me to New England, but it was rejected. The plot was laid by Peter, Weld, and others."²

¹ Tuesday, Jan. 26, 1640. "It was this day reported in the House [of Commons] from a committee, that there were above 50 families, of *Norwich*, that went away to New *England*, by reason of Bishop *Wren's* pressing their Consciences with illegal Oaths, Ceremonies, and Innovations." — *Rushworth's Hist., Col. 4, 158.*

² Prynne's *Canterburies Doom*, p. 57. The unhappy prelate was misinformed, at least as to Mr. Peter, who was not at his "troubles or death." — *Last Legacy to his Daughter.* 1660, 103.

Since Parliament rejected the more lenient proposal that Laud should simply be obliged to reside among his victims, the Independents in New England, the comedy was soon changed to tragedy. Laud went to the scaffold, January 10, 1645, and so perished, at one blow, the providential founder and malignant enemy of New England, — William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury. Mr. Macaulay thinks "the severest punishment which the two Houses could have inflicted on him would have been to set him at liberty, and sent him to Oxford. There he might have stayed, tortured by his own diabolical temper, hungering for Puritans to pillory and mangle, . . . performing grimaces and antics in the cathedral, continuing that incomparable diary, which we never see without forgetting the vices of his heart in the abject imbecility of his intellect, minuting down his dreams, counting the drops of blood which fell from his nose, watching the direction of his salt, and listening for the note of the screech-owl. Contemptuous mercy was the only vengeance which it became the parliament to take on such a ridiculous old bigot."¹

A Yorkshire tribute to Laud, in 1645, shows his efficient, though undesigned agency in the rapid colonization of New England with the choicest men and soundest scholarship of Old England: "Now the Prelate here brings his 'gift' to the 'altar'; he hath a prayer in his hand instead of in his heart, to 'offer,' but he should remember . . . all those godly preachers and Christians whom his bloody cruelty caused to flee into the deserts of America, as Mr. Cotton, Mr. Hooker, Mr. Davenport, Mr. Peters, with many thousands more."² Those very men have been charged, directly and indirectly, with the premature exit of that admired and consummate churchman, January 10, 1645. His works have been edited with affectionate fidelity in the Anglo-Catholic Library.³

¹ Review of Hallam's *Constitutional Hist.*, 1828.

² Burton's *Grand Impostor*, 1645, in Hanbury, ii, 523, 524. — Parker's *Life of Laud*.

³ In Dean Milman's *Annals of St. Paul's Church*, xiii, he speaks of Laud's total want of the purest Christian virtues blended with some of the most unchristian vices . . . his writings are below contempt, and betray or rather dwell with pride on a feeble superstition and a most debasing view of God. . . . Among his vices were servility to the great, haughtiness to the lowly; the sternest, most inflexible

In 1643 Mr. Peters prefaced and published Mr. Richard Mather's reply of the New England churches "to two and thirty questions sent over to them by divers ministers of England" on church government, with two other New England treatises on government, in answer to "divers reverend and godly ministers in England." He was equally vigilant against the state-church ambition of the Scotch. "Is it not an ungodly thing to suffer men to be of any religion? . . . Ought we not at least to keep our different opinions and religions to ourselves in obedience to the civil magistrate?" asked Baylie, the Presbyterian.¹

Mr. Peters was recognized, in 1656, as "the Father of our Church [of Independency] and Champion of our Reformed Religion."² But like a logical and practical man, as he was, he labored for a thorough reformation, and his volume, entitled *Good Work for a Good Magistrate*, contains practical suggestions in affairs of state,³ matter of admiration to the legal mind of England to-day.

intolerance, hard cruelty . . . He commanded, still commands, the desperate admiration of those who dwell more on the church than on the religion which that church was founded to promulgate and maintain." The American admirer of this prelate — for such there is — did not dedicate his "*memoir*" to the Dean of St. Paul's.

¹ Baylie's *Dissuasive*, ch. v, 95.

² It is quoted in *Israel's Condition . . . Vindication of Mr. Hugh Peter from the foul aspersions of W. Prynn, Esq.*, London. 1656. pp. 80, 90.

³ "Good Work | for a good | Magistrate, | or, | A Short Cut to great quiet. | By | Honest, homely, plain English | Hints given from Scripture, Reason, and Experience, for the regulating | of most cases in this Com- | monwealth. | Concerning Religion; Mercie; Justice. | by H[ugh] P[eters.] Prov. 14, 34, *Righteousness exalteth a Nation; but Sin is a | Reproach to anie People.* | London, Printed by William Du Gard Printer to the | Council of State, 1651." dedicated "To the Supreme Power and all true Patriots under them," His "*Model for the Law*" proposes Registries for deeds, wills and testaments. "Summons may be left at men's houses; and not such a nest of bailifs maintained, even an Armie of Caterpillars; the worst of men employed that waie." "Long laying in prison before sentence; or delaies in justice is great crueltie to men." Petty local courts to settle trifling disputes summarily, all entails to be cut off forever, canals for cheap transportation, copyright to authors, hospitals for the insane and the sick, banks for pawn for the poor, are among his suggestions.

Mr. Peters also thinks that "the civil Fathers of the Fatherless" should teach orphans and the friendless not only to "read, write, &c.," but "when big enough to be set to work, to learn something to live by," and to provide houses where to

The undesigned evidence in the pages of their opponents, especially of the chief Presbyterian writers, affords conclusive proof of the potent agency of Independency in English affairs. They charge and fix on them the responsibility for the doctrines of Christian liberty and popular government, which triumphed in the English Commonwealth as well as in America,—to them, a cause of

“Torment, and loud lament, and furious rage”;

To the ages, of grateful praise and world-wide benediction.

Rutherford, one of the chief commissioners of the Church of Scotland, who sat with the Assembly at Westminster, and Professor of Divinity in the Scotch University of St. Andrews, could not tolerate what he called “the cursed pamphlets that pass press and pulpit . . . for [the] abominable, atheistical plague of Liberty of Conscience.”¹

The National Assembly of Scotland, in 1647, prohibited the importation or reading of all books and pamphlets favoring Independency, and forbidding any harboring of persons infected with such errors, and this to be enforced at the sword’s point.

The Presbyterians in Scotland were supreme. “Independents pray,” Rutherford says it with horror, “that God would grant them the grace of liberty of conscience.” Cromwell’s letter to Parliament, that “in things of the minde we looke for no compulsion but that of light and reason,” he pronounces “unsound, and scandalous to me and many others,” and adds, “To my knowledge, there is not this day in England any that is a meere Independent, . . . with most of those of New England, which maintaineth nothing but Independencie, that

“bring them up to all manner of trades,” the children of the State, pp. 26, 27. Does not this wise man here anticipate our Industrial Art Schools, Normal Art Schools, on the principle that compulsory education in skilled labor, to prevent poverty and crime, is wiser than the system of poorhouses and prisons to receive it? Where there is a Duty there is a Right, and the general adoption of Mr. Peters’ suggestions would soon be felt in the annual returns of increasing intelligence, industry, and wealth, and decreasing ignorance, pauperism, and crime, and their enormous waste in the body politic.

¹ *Spiritual Antichrist*, 1648, ix, 251-253, 259; also *Rushworth’s Hist. Col.*, vii, 767-771.

does not hold other unsound and corrupt tenets, especially that of liberty of conscience, which bordereth with atheism, skepticism, and with all faiths and no faith." To which he significantly adds, "They are ordinary preachers to the Generall and the rest of the Commanders."

Walker's *History of Independency*, 1648, defines it as the "*Genus generalissimum* of all Errours, Heresies, Blasphemies and Schisms. A generall name and Title under which they are all united, as *Sampson's* foxes were by the *Tailes*. . . . Nye, Goodwin and Hugh Peters are among the chief of their ministers, . . . Cromwell their Don Quixote, . . . and Hugh Peters¹ Chaplaine in ordinary to two great Potentates, *Luci-*

¹ Mr. Peters was "of great service to Cromwell," says Bishop Burnet, in Anderson's *Colonial Church*, ch. xiv. 156, ed. 1856. The Rev. John Bathurst Deane, in his memoir of Richard Deane, the tyrannicide, says "that Oliver Cromwell was the life and soul of the regicidal [tyrannicidal] conspiracy. . . . But if we give implicit credit to the Royalists, and judge of their subsequent action upon their own convictions, not Oliver Cromwell but Hugh Peters was the man who first conceived the idea of bringing the King to trial and to death. . . . Hence the especial animosity of the Royalists of the Restoration against Peters; and the strange irregularities of his trial in 1660 as a 'regicide,' and his conviction upon evidence which in our days would be rejected with scorn as no evidence at all, or with indignation as suborned perjury," 364. The reverend author scorns "the notion that all schismatics are rational beings and have a common and honest object, whereas . . . it is notorious that the natural repugnance of the human mind to uniformity and conformity is only to be overcome by the force of authority, and that left to itself the 'Protestant' mind has a tendency to run into what," etc. Are, then, "all rational beings" churchmen, and all churchmen "rational beings . . . only by force of authority"? But as Mr. Deane's "church" is only a creature of Parliament, a reflex of the times, and as "left to itself the Protestant [Parliamentary] mind has a tendency to run into" endless vagaries about candles or no candles, or like questions of Christian life, "human" minds and "rational beings" may be puzzled to keep in line with and to know for a certainty what happens to be, at the time, in "uniformity and conformity" with the national "catholic" church; and what can "rational minds" do without "force of authority" in this dilemma? Who is "authority" with Mr. Deane? Newman, Philpot, or Colenso? "When doctors disagree," etc. A notable and painful illustration of this duplicity and dishonor in John Henry Newman's history of his religious opinions shows "what the Protestant mind" of the Church of England "has a tendency to run into"! When Newman thought of openly avowing his "catholic" faith, Keble, the church poet,—whose hymn to "Charles the Martyr" is since obsolete, by Act of Parliament,—urged him to retain his *living* as if he were not a Romanist but still a "Protestant," whereupon Newman wrote to Keble again, "The following considerations have much reconciled my feelings to your conclusions: 1. I do not think we have yet made fair trial how much the English Church will bear. I know it is a hazardous experiment, like proving cannon.

fer and *Oliver*." He calls Milton "a 'Libertine . . . that (after the Independent fashion) will be tied by no obligation," and describes the Independents as "a complication of all Anti-monarchicall, Anarchicall heresies and schismes,—Anabaptists, Brownists, Barrowists, Adamites, Familists, Libertines of all sorts . . . united under the general Title of *Independent*; and these were originally the men that by their close insinuations, solicitations, and actings began and carried on the Warre against the King, with an intent (from the beginning) to pull down Monarchy and set up Anarchy." He says they seduced the Presbyterians, who were "not strong enough to hold such subtle Sampsons."¹

After the "crowning mercy" at Worcester,—the defeat of the Scots army on their way to reinstate Charles, with the Kirk as the established religion,—Milton, in his sonnet to Cromwell, says, —

"Yet much remains

To conquer still; Peace hath her victories

No less renowned than War; new foes arise

Threat'ning to bind our souls with secular chains:

Help us to save free conscience from the paw

Of hireling wolves, whose gospel is their maw."

Yet we must not take it for granted that the metal will burst in the operation. It has borne at various times, not to say at this time [October, 1840], a great infusion of catholic truth without damage. As to the result, viz., whether this process will not approximate the whole English Church, as a body, to Rome, that is nothing to us. For what we know, it may be the providential means of uniting the whole Church in one, without fresh schismatizing or use of private judgment." *Apologia pro vita sua*, 1864, 239; 1874, 135. Of course these are not the "blind owls which hawk in the dark and dare not come into the light," predicted by Tyndale in 1530. Here was no betrayal of trust, no perfidy, only "an infusion of Catholic truth" into their charges; and if the alien Church of Rome should *reoccupy* its former "seats and nests," "that is nothing to us!" So Keble and Newman honorably retained their *Protestant* "livings"! I could hardly distinguish the trappings, ceremonies, and service of the English St. Alban's, in London, from the Jesuit ritual. The name of Keble, suppressed in the first edition of Newman's *Apologia*, is given in the second. The secret plotting of 1840 is overt and defiant in 1874. "That is nothing to us!" In the Diocesan Synod, Oxford, November, 1850, when Bishop Wilberforce said, "Suppose, now, that there should be any one in this assembly so false to the Church of Baptism as to be actually in league with the Church of Rome while ministering at our altars," the immediate answer was, "My Lord, there are a hundred of them in this [Sheldonian] theatre." But that "is nothing to us"!

¹ 29, 32. Part ii, 1649, 157, 180, 199, 200.

Hume says, "The Scotch nation plainly discovered, after the Restoration, that their past resistance had proceeded more from . . . the bigotry of their ecclesiastics than from any fixed passion toward civil liberty."

The Presbyterian champion, Robert Baylie, of Glasgow, in 1645 laments that "This unhappy love towards liberty, whereinto the Independents have lately fallen, makes them to entreat the magistrate to let alone the affaires of religion."¹

The mere title of Rutherford's book, in 1648, is an index of the times, and the prejudice which the common-sense of the Independents had to overcome. It is *A Survey of the Spiritual Antichrist, opening the secrets of Familisme and Antinomianism in the Antichristian doctrine of John Saltmarsh and William Dell, the present preachers of the army now in England*. He devotes a chapter to "the Familists and Antinomians in New England," and he states the appalling fact that "Saltmarsh, chaplain to the Generall, Sir Tho. Fairfax, goes along with the Familists of New England,"² and draws heavily from Governor Winthrop's *Short Story*³ about the "first authors" of these

¹ The religion of Him whose message was "Peace on earth and good-will towards men," depends not on constitutional recognition or legal formulas. In all ages Christianity has suffered more from professed or well-meaning friends than from open enemies. Christianity is part and parcel of the law of the land only because Christianity first saturated society, was prior to the law, greater than the law, nay, more, had created it, had infused itself into the feelings and thought, the daily life of the people, because it constituted the civilization of the land, and so crystallized into law. An oath in civil proceedings implies ages of education in the religious faith of which it is an expression. But if a religion comes to ask for cold mention in the statute, to depend on law, its own creature, as on a crutch for support, it will be a confession of its own decrepitude,—that it has become weaker than the law, the outgrowth of itself, and ceases to trust in its own strength. When the spirit of religion has shrunk into rigid formalities and lifeless mechanism and ceremony has withered into costly architecture,—"quarries set to music,"—over whose porch "THE POOR HAVE THE GOSPEL PREACHED TO THEM,"—the glory of Christianity,—would be a cutting jest,—then scepticism will lift the veil of hypocrisy and find no life there. John Locke well says, "A religion that is of God wants not the assistance of human authority to make it prevail."

² "In Old England 'the Independents' make it a fighting with God to deny a free liberty to Papists, to the worst heresies and schismes, to Judaism, Turcism, Paganism, or if any error can be imagined to be more pernicious."—Baylie's *Dissuasive*, 129, also Rushworth's *Hist. Col.*, vii, part iv, 770.

³ An idiotic story of a monstrous birth at the time of these troubles (October, 1637), "certified by John Winthrop, gent, of the Massachusetts, who saw it," found its way into the public archives.—*Calendar of State Papers, Colonial*, edited by W. Noël Sainsbury, 1577-1660, p. 259.

awful heresies in New England, as Mistress Hutchinson and Mr. Wheelwright, then preaching "seditious railing and foul tenets." With the opponents of Cotton, Vane and Hutchinson, "heresy" and "sedition" were convertible terms.

When the Independents or Republicans demanded the repeal of the several acts against "sectaries," the Presbyterian, Walker, exclaims: "What is this but to pray in ayde of Turkes, Jewes, Anabaptists of *Munster*, nay the Devill himself to joyne with them . . . in this impious Liberty of Conscience to destroy the Protestant religion . . . under the Kingdome of these bloody cheating Saints."¹ The Spanish inquisition would have been edified by their holy horror at the mere suggestion of toleration, or freedom of opinion; they did not object at all to persecution, but would enforce the use of their *Directory* in place of the *Common Prayer*.

There is in Mr. Cotton's answer to the criticisms of Mr. Baylie,² a passage of great interest as to the origin of New England and its reflex on Old England, and also of the highest historical authority as the testimony of a principal character in both lands. He says, "Many thousands in *England* in all the Quarters of the kingdome, have been awakened to consider of the cause of Church discipline, for which wee have suffered this hazardous and voluntary banishment into this remote Wilderness: and have therefore by letters conferred with us about it, & been (through mercy) so farre enlightened, as to desire an utter subversion of Episcopacy, and conformity, yea, and the Honorable Houses of Parliament, the Lord hath been pleased to helpe them so farre to consider of our sufferings,

¹ Walker's *Anarchia Anglicana; or, the History of Independency. The second part.* 1649, 202. Hopkins' *Puritans and Queen Elizabeth.* v. 57, chaps. vii, viii.

² Dr. Sanderson, afterward bishop of Lincoln, wrote, April 10, 1649: "I thank you for the loan of your book, Rob. Bailie's *Dissuasive from Error.* . . . I cannot but admire . . . how the author could choose but see that most of the assertions both of Brownists and Independents are but the natural conclusions and results of their own premises. These [*sic*] kind of writings do exceedingly confirm me in my old opinions, viz., that the grounds of our busy reformers supposed true, either of these ways is infinitely more rational and defensible, and more consentaneous to the principles whereon the endeavours of reformation are built than Presbyterians." Nov. 12, 1652, he classifies "Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists, or other by whatsoever name they called," as "Puritan sectaries." *Sanderson's Works. Jacobson.* v. 57, vi. 368.

and of the causes thereof, as to conclude a necesstie of reformation of the Ecclesiasticall state, (amongst other causes, so), by reason of the necessitie put upon so many *English* subjects to depart from all our employments, and enjoyments in our Native Countrey, for conscience sake.

“For the fruits of Congregationall discipline in *England*, they that walke in that way amongst you, might speak far more particularly, and largely, then I here can doe at such a remote distance. But if Books, and Letters, and reports doe not too much abuse us with false intelligence, the great, and gracious, and glorious victories, whereby the Lord hath wrought salvation for *England* in these late warres . . . his own right hand hath brought to passe chiefly by such despised instruments as are sirnamed Independents. And are then the witnesses of that way so dangerous to the rest of the world. . . . For the chieftest instruments, which God hath delighted to use herein, have been the Faith and fidelity, the courage and constancy of Independents. And when I say Independents, I mean . . . such as professe the Kingdom of Christ in the government of each holy Congregation of Saints within themselves.”

Acknowledging the great services of Scotland “for the helpe of England against the Common Enemies of Church and State,” Mr. Cotton writes, “But yet¹ let the good pleasure of the Lord bee acknowledged, who out of his abundant grace, hath granted the chieftest successes to the English designs by the Forces of the Independents, which may not be denied without too much ingratitude both to God and man. Let all the glory thereof be wholly and solely given to the Lord: but yet let not the instruments be accounted unfruitfull, by whom the Lord hath brought forth such blessed Fruits of victory, and libertie, both from civill servitude, and superstitious thraldome, and withall so great an advancement of Reformation both in Church and State.”²

¹ Milton says in his *Defence of the People of England*, the Scots “preferred the king before their religion, their liberty, and that very celebrated ecclesiastical covenant of theirs.” *Prose Works*. Bohn’s edition, i, 191. “The Independents, as they are called, were the only men that, from first to last, kept to their point, and knew what use to make of their victory.” *Ibid.* 193.

² *The Way of | Congregational | Churches | cleared: | In two Treatises. | In the former | From the Historical Aspersions of Mr. | Robert Baylie, in his Book, |*

Compare with these sober words and tone of modest triumph, Milton's poetic strain :—

“What numbers of faithful and freeborn Englishmen, and good Christians, have been constrained to forsake their dearest home, their friends and kindred, whom nothing but the wide ocean, and the savage deserts of America, could hide and shelter from the fury of the bishops? O, sir, if we could but see the shape of our dear mother England, as poets are wont to give a personal form to what they please, how would she appear, think ye, but in a mourning weed, with ashes upon her head, and tears abundantly flowing from her eyes, to behold so many of her children exposed at once, and thrust from things of dearest necessity, because their conscience could not assent to things which the bishops thought indifferent. What more binding than conscience? What more free than indifferency? . . . There cannot be a more ill-boding sign to a nation (God turn the omen from us !), than when the inhabitants, to avoid insufferable grievances at home, are enforced by heaps to forsake their native country.”¹

Thus the genius of Milton glowingly portrays the birth and exodus of New England from the old home.

Mr. Carlyle portrays, in his way, the character and achievements of New England's Apostle of Independency :—

“Reverend John Cotton is a man still held in some remembrance among our New-England friends. He had been Minister of Boston in Lincolnshire; carried the name across the Ocean with him; fixed it upon a new small Home he had found there,—which has become a large one since; the big busy Capital of Massachusetts, *Boston*, so called. *John Cotton his Mark*, very curiously stamped on the face of this Planet; likely to continue for some time! — For the rest, a painful Preacher, oracular of high Gospels to New [and old] England; who in his day was well seen to be connected with the Supreme Powers of this Universe, the word of him being as a live-coal to the hearts of many. He died some years afterwards [1652, Dec. 23];—was thought, especially on his death bed, to have manifested gifts even of Prophecy,²—a thing not inconceivable to the human mind that well considers Prophecy and John Cotton.”³

called [A | Disswasive from the, Errors of the Time.] | In the latter, From some Contradictions | of | Vindicae Clavium: | And from Some Mis-constructions of Learned Mr. | Rutherford in his Book intituled [The | due Rights of Presbyteries.] | By Mr. John Cotton, sometime Preacher at Boston | in Lincoln-shire, and now Teacher of | the Church at Boston, in | New England. | London, | Printed by Matthew Simmons, for John Bellamie, | at the signe of the three Golden-Lions, | in Cornhill, 1648. | See pages 102, 22, 103.

¹ *Of Reformation in England in Prose Works.* Bohn's Ed. ii, 399.

² Thurloe, i, 586; in 1653.

³ *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches: with Elucidations* by Thomas Carlyle. Letter clxxxiv.

Mr. Hutchinson, the historian of Massachusetts, says, 1764: "There came over amongst many others in this year, 1633, Mr. Haynes, of the civil order; Mr. Cotton, Mr. Hooker, and Mr. Stone, three of the most famous men of the religious order;" and adds: "Mr. Cotton is supposed to have been *more instrumental in the settlement of their civil as well as ecclesiastical polity, than any other person.*" On the authority of a MS. letter of Mr. Samuel Whiting, he states that "Mr. Cotton's removal was hastened by letters missive which were out against him to convent him before the high commission court for non-conformity. His friends advised him to keep close until he had an opportunity of embarking." ¹

Now listen to the exultation of the Pilgrims: "Full litle did I thinke," writes Bradford, "y^t the downfall of y^e Bishops, with their courts, cannons, & ceremonies, &c., had been so neare. . . . Doe you not now see y^e fruits of your labours, O all yee servants of y^e Lord that have suffered for his truth, and have been faithfull witneses of y^e same, and yee litle handfull amongst y^e rest, y^e least amongst y^e thousands of Israll? You have not only had a seede time, but many of you have seene y^e joyefull harvest; should you not then rejoyse, yea, and againe rejoyce, and say Hallelu-iah, salvation, and glorie, and honour, and power, be to y^e Lord our God; for true and righteous are his judgments. Rev. 19. 1, 2. But thou wilte aske what is y^e mater? What is done? Why, art thou a stranger in Israll, that thou shouldest not know what is done? Are not those Jebusites overcome that have vexed the people of Israll so long, . . . those proud Anakimes are throwne downe, and their glorie laid in y^e dust. The tiranous bishops are ejected, their courts dissolved, their cannons forceless, their servise casheired, their ceremonies uselese and despised; their plots for popery prevented, and all their superstitions discarded & returned to Roome from whence they came, and y^e monuments of idolatrie rooted out of y^e land. And the proud and profane suporters, and cruel defenders of these (as bloody papists & wicked athists, and their malignante consorts) marvelously overthrowne. Are not these great things? Who can deny it?

¹ *Hist. of Massachusetts*, Ed. 1795, i, 37, 165. *Hutchinson Papers*, 243-249.

"But who hath done it? Who, even he that sitteth on y^e white horse, who is caled faithfull, & true, and judgeth and fighteth righteously, Rev : 19. 11. . . . The King of Kings, and Lord of Lords. v. 15, 16. Hallelu-iah. Anno Dom : 1646."

The principle of Independency which Cotton stated so clearly, and which Robinson and he defended with so much learning, and of which their disciples were the historical vindicators at the cost of everything but manhood, is both the foundation and the key-stone of American civil polity, is embodied in every American Constitution, and forms the substance of American protest against European polities. It is the ultimate principle for which Hampden, Russell, and Sidney died, and for which nominal Christendom has blindly endured centuries of fearful strife and bloody anarchy.

The Plymouth Church was a community of citizens ; that community was a democracy, civil and religious, a town,¹ a commonwealth, the mother of like towns and commonwealths which in constitutional union, elected delegates or representatives, and so a republic grew up. Plymouth was the germ, the National Republic the fruit. The facts require a stronger statement than that of De Tocqueville, that the democratic and republican polity of the Pilgrims contributed powerfully to the establishment of a republic and a democracy in public affairs, for it *created* the republic.

It was a fatal blunder of the British ministry to attempt to interfere with, to "regulate" the New England town-meeting, and it probably quickened ² "the Boston movement to unite all the towns in the province, with an ultimate view to a similar union of the colonies." This was approved by the legislature of Virginia and immediately extended over all the colo-

¹ The municipality in New England was the simplest of all municipal forms and the best adapted to develope the republican idea. . . . The rise of this system in the thirteen colonies which became the United States, shows how the republican idea, from the first, undermined feudalism at its root. . . . It was the primordial unit in which the republican idea was embodied at the time of the Declaration of Independence. — Hon. Richard Frothingham in *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*. October, 1870, 19, 31, 38. See also Mr. Tudor's admirable reflections in *Life of James Otis*. 1823. 443-451.

² Arnold's *Hist. Rhode Island*, ii, 324.

nies. . . . Rhode Island was the first to follow the example of Virginia in electing a committee of correspondence.

So the germinal principle of Pilgrim polity pervades the history of American liberty. Rejecting the proposed constitution of 1778, because it only "allowed" and did not affirm the inalienable rights of conscience, and not content with a general statement of the rights of man, the people reiterate with emphasis and in various forms the guarantees of religious freedom. One¹ of them is that "the several religious societies of this Commonwealth, whether corporate or unincorporate . . . shall ever have the right to elect their pastors or religious teachers, to contract with them for their support," etc. This is a crucible for all organic political error, the radix from which springs all other guarantees of the Constitution; it is the soul of the Constitution.

We return to the testimony of the enemies of New England.

Mr. Edwards, the Presbyterian,² styles "Master Peters,³ the Vicar General and Metropolitan of the Independents, both in New and Old England . . . the Solicitor General for the Secretaries [the Independents] who came out of New England about four years and four months ago, concerning whose preaching . . . and proceedings in city and country I could write a whole book. . . . This man is an ubiquitary here and there, in this country and in that country, in the army and at London. Whenever the Independents or some other Sectaries are about any great design or business, he must be sent for though from the army. . . . Now that their design for a toleration hath lately been more vigorously prosecuted . . . I am persuaded

¹ *Const. of Mass., Art. XI, Amend'ts.* In the Girard case, Mr. Webster declared that the American precedent of a voluntary support of religion under free institutions, without any established order, "will in time to come shake all the hierarchies of Europe."

² Edwards' *Gangraena*. 1646, Pt. i, 214; ii, 61.

³ While this *proof* is in hand, I have found two signatures of Mr. Peters in Thane's *British Autography*, ii, 54, one of 1643, and one of 1653, in both of which he uses the final s. Thane's portrait of Mr. Peters "from an original drawing" closely resembles the more finished and expressive face in the collection of nine medallions facing a pamphlet of 1715: "Popery and Schism equally dangerous to the Church of England." The central figure, Ignatius Loyola, with "*Constitutiones Societatis Jesu*," in hand, is surrounded by *Tho: Heth, F. Commin, J. Knox, Garnet, Parsons, H. Peters, D. Bilinguis*, and *Wm. Penn.*

Mr. Peters' late coming up from the Army hath to do with that. . . . He is so bold, daring and active for the sectaries . . . that when he had express letters . . . without all excuse or longer delay to come to New England . . . there were meetings of several Independent ministers (of the Grandees) to consult and resolve this case of Conscience . . . the result was that Mr. Peters being so useful a man here he should not go, but stay in England . . . if twenty Churches sent for him."

Edwards complains that "there is hardly a noted Sectary in the Kingdom or out of New England, Holland," who has not some office or position of respect — and can no way abide the Independency and other opinions which, "first broached in New England, have come over into old." He denounces "Master John Bachiler, Licenser Generall of the Sectaries' books and of all sorts of wicked opinions," of which he has found 176, and says "many more might be added," especially for his licensing the reprint of Leonard Busher's¹ treatise of 1614, pleading that it "may be lawful to write, dispute, confer, print and publish any matter touching religion, either for or against whomsoever," and that Bachiler's "wickedness may the more appear," he had ordered the passages for Toleration should be printed in "great letters." He concludes, "I am afraid that if the Devill himself should make a book, and give it the title, 'A Plea for Liberty of Conscience,' with certain reasons against persecution for religion, and bring it to Mr. Bachiler, he would license it, and not only with a bare *imprimatur* but set before it the commendation of A Useful Treatise, of A sweet and excellent booke, making for love and peace among brethren; or some such discourse." (*Gangraena*, Part III, ii, 36, 103, 242.) For example, Mr. Cotton's "*Way of Congregational Churches Cleared,*" bears the following, "The worthy name of the Reverend and Learned Author of this Treatise

¹ In 1609, five years before Busher's tract, Mr. Jacob had published "An Humble Supplication for *Toleration*, and Liberty to enjoy and observe the Ordinances of Jesus Christ in the administration of His Churches in lieu of human Constitutions," and in "A Declaration" written in 1611, with admirable clearness he says, — "where each ordinary congregation giveth their free consent in their own government, there certainly each congregation is an entire and INDEPENDENT body-politic, and indued with power immediately under and from Christ, as every proper Church is, and ought to be"! — Hanbury's *Independents*, i, 224-231.

(which with delight I have perused) is a sufficient argument to perswade, not onely to the reading of it, but also to a beliefe and expectation of something Excellent therein. *Imprimatur*, Jan. 7, 1647 [8]. John Bachiler."

In the prefatory matter of his "three fold discourse," published in 1651, on "*The Inconsistencie of the Independent way*," Mr. Cawdrey, a member of the Westminster Assembly, says of Mr. Cotton and Mr. Hooker, "It is some mens happinesse¹ . . . that write they (or preach they) . . . they finde some admirers to cry them up, all their words as Oracles, and all their works as Wonders." . . . Mr. Cotton's "*Way Cleared* . . . and other Books of that *Way* published, were highly esteemed as unanswerable, and very taking with weak and unsettled mindes, to the disturbance of the peace of the [Presbyterian] Church; . . . especially that Reverend and Learned Mr. Hooker's *Survey of Church-Discipline*, which I heard most magnified, as the strongest piece of that *Way*," and Mr. Cawdrey confesses himself "provoked by the importunate and reiterated recognition of those Tracts, those *Models* (as they call them) of the *Church-Way*."

He denounces "the new pretended principle of Christian Liberty or liberty of conscience. . . . under the Name, Shadow, and Shelter of Independency (as another Trojan horse) . . . to open a door to as many divisions as there are Churches, none having any power beyond their own Church: whereby all Religion, all Heresies, may be tolerated, and none can hinder it . . . every man hath liberty to propagate his own erroneous notions, and every man takes the License to hear whom he likes best, as most agreeable to his own opinion . . . seeking and trying all the new waies of religion . . . all sorts of men . . . like well of and comply with the Independent way, as granting more liberty than the Presbyterian will." He bewails "the miserable rents and divisions, the errors and heresies and blasphemies broken out in this Church of *England*, since their way got footing and countenance here . . . the many mischievous consequences of those principles, and sad effects of the prac-

¹ Baylie writes from London, Dec. 7, 1643, "My pamphlets do not sell. Have bought up some of my Laudensium and Parallels hither, but for [to] no purpose."
—Letter No. 39.

tice of the Independent way in Old England, fully manifested in these last few years" . . . found to be so dangerous to Presbyterian rule, and threatening its utter dissolution.

Mr. Cawdrey addresses his remonstrance particularly "to the Reverend Author . . . Mr. John Cotton . . . as a Leader to many (such is the respect to his person) . . . and authority . . . in reputation for learning and holiness."

"Happy were it for *Old England*," exclaims the unhappy Cawdrey, "if our Dissenting Brethren would hearken betimes. . . . Little did we think, that those who outstood the Sabbatical profanations of the Prelates, their reproaches and scoffs . . . would have so soon declined upon a new pretended principle of Christian Liberty, or Liberty of Conscience . . . but . . . the Sun (of Toleration) can make the Traveller . . . cast aside his garment, which the stormy windes (of persecution) could not do."

Such was the work of New England in Old England. The testimony is unimpeachable, the reproach has become a tribute.

"It had been happy for *England*," says the dejected Baylie, "that Master *Cotton* had taken longer time for deliberation before that change of his minde. . . . God in wisdom permits his dearest children to set black marks on their own faces. . . . I would not willingly detract from any man's reputation . . . yet when his gifts are turned into snares . . . as his eminent endowments are strong invitations to run after him; so the mixture of clear weakness may be . . . a caveat from God, to beware of his wayes, as well as of any other mans."

Edwards charges Mr. Hugh Peters "with improving his whole time in preaching against the Presbyterian government and for a toleration of all sects."

And Peter does seem to have been almost everywhere. With the Earl of Warwick at the siege of Lynn, in 1644; in 1645, with Lord Fairfax at the capture of Bridgewater, for the news of which and with thanks for his universal services he was rewarded by Parliament, and so he continued in great influence with the generals, and Parliament.¹

¹ The gist of Mr. Thomas Goodwin's sermon before Parliament "at their late solemn *fast*, Feb. 25, 1645," was that "they do and will differ in judgment . . . the Apostles could not prevent it . . . let us not judge one another any more . . .

In his "Last Report," 1646, he says, "Teach the peasants to understand liberty." "It is one of the greatest interests of the state to keep war at a distance." "Wrangling is none of our proper work."

Mr. Baylie¹ said, "Of all the by-paths wherein the wanderers of our time are pleased to walk, this [of Independency] is the most considerable. . . . There be few of the noted Sects which are not a great deal more numerous; but this Way, what it wants in number, supplies by the weight of its followers." After five years endeavours and great industry the Independents were less than 1000 in number, men and women included, but "of so eminent a condition, that not any nor all the rest of the Sects are comparable to them; for they have been so wise as to engage to their party some of chief note, in both Houses of Parliament, in the Assembly of Divines, in the Army, in the City and Countrey-Committees; all whom they daily manage with such dexterity and diligence, for the benefit of their Cause, that the eyes of the world begin to fall upon them more than upon all their fellows." Lord Clarendon, to the same point, says, "The Independents [Divines] were more learned and rational than the Presbyterians; and though they had not so great congregations of the common people, yet they affected and were followed by the most substantial and wealthy citizens, as well as by others of better condition."

Thus it appears that except to the Independents — and they were only a handful — the idea of a State without *a* Religion, — a state-religion — was a thing incredible, anarchical, and of such monstrous impiety as to provoke divine wrath and vengeance. Milton's lines "on the new Forcers of Conscience under the Long Parliament," represents the position of things just then:—

and so end all the quarrels," . . . Christ "will not rest till such time as he hath made us one, if not in judgment, yet in forbearance . . . and we shall be made to do it one way or another." Even so, Mr. Goodwin. In his "Good work for a good magistrate," 1651, p. 34, Mr. Peters puts first among the "Rules of Justice," "None can be free of great injustice, who by persecution for religion take awaie libertie of conscience from anie, whose principles or practises are not dangerous to the government, Peace, Proprietie, and Commonwealth; if they otherwise live but civilly. For as God himself, so his Vicegerent the Magistrate must cause his Sun to shine, and his rain to fall both upon good and bad."

¹ "*Dissuasive*," chap. iii, pp. 52, 53, 90.

"Because you have thrown off your Prelate lord,
 And with stiff vows renounced his liturgy,
 To seize the widow'd whore Plurality
 From them whose sin ye envied, not abhorr'd,
 Dare ye for this adjure the civil sword
 To force our consciences that Christ set free,
 And ride us with a classic hierarchy
 Taught ye by mere A. S. and Rotherford?
 Men whose life, learning, faith and pure intent,
 Would have been held in high esteem with Paul,
 Must now be named and printed Heretics,
 By shallow Edwards and Scotch what-d'ye-call:
 But we [Independents] do hope to find out all your tricks,
 Your plots and packings worse than those of Trent.
 New Presbyter is but Old Priest writ large."

The two great sects, Presbyterians and Episcopalians, were "a-fighting for the crown," each eager to grasp the sword of the bigot; yet, out of the usual course in which popular will or apathy is the assumed basis of government, the Independents, without a party, but energized by the supremacy of a divine idea, took the reins of authority; and the brief period of their rule, conceded to be the noblest in English history, yet sheds its beneficent influence over the world. Europe studies the lesson to-day. In a letter to the Magistrates of Massachusetts in 1671, Dr. John Owen, Philip Nye, and the dissenting clergy of London commend Harvard College as a "school of the prophets," some of whom, "God hath used for service to himself in both Englands." Of the twenty graduates prior to 1646, twelve went to Europe, eleven of whom never returned to New England.¹

George Downing, of the first class, 1642, before mentioned, was chaplain to the regiment of the terrible John Okey, — Carlyle's "fierce colonel and zealous Anabaptist," — whose "thousand dragoons were always counted," says Markham,² "the best men in the army" of the great Lord Fairfax, and did their full share at Naseby, June 14, 1645. There is a report of his sermon at Hackney, Aug. 16, 1646, in which he is called "Master Downing, Preacher to the Army, *alias* Hugh Peters,

¹ Quincy's *Hist. of Harvard College*, i, 16.

² *Life of Fairfax*, p. 148.

junior, young Peters he was called,"¹ Cromwell's Scout-Master, General head of the intelligence department; he sat in three of Oliver's parliaments and was a frequent speaker on religious questions. In the House of Commons he confessed he had been a minister, when Major-General Whalley called on him to serve in the casual absence of the morning Chaplain. In the next December he was sent as the Protector's agent to the United Provinces of Holland, to whom Milton commended him as "a person of eminent quality, and after a long trial of his fidelity, probity and diligence in several and various negotiations, well approved and valued . . . in our knowledge and esteem."

In the Fall of 1643 Mr. Roger Williams revisited England. His companions on the Sempringham Road, Cotton and Hooker, had come up to his position and "durst not join in the use of the Common Prayer." Their correspondence and writings were doing brave work for the truth in England. But as Cotton thought it "no disgrace to change either judgment or practice² upon better information, so Williams himself had gone up higher,³ and the old New England friendship with Sir Henry Vane was quickened anew in their intrepid devotion to the great cause, despite opprobrium and obloquy, caring not for "the argument of multitudes and numbers against one."

Not long after appeared his *Queries of Highest Consideration*, presented to Parliament, which Dr. Orme ranks with Robinson's *Justification of Separation from the Church of England*, 1639, as containing "the most accurate statements

¹ Edwards' "Gangraena," iii, 81.

² *Narragansett Club Pub.* ii, 40. To Mr. Baylie's "unsavory metaphor of my distaste of Episcopall government," Mr. Cotton replied, "Conscientious judgment in matters of religion is not led by taste or distaste: will he say, that both the Parliaments of England and Scotland have abolished Episcopall government upon a distaste?" *Way Cleared*, p. 19. Mr. Cotton was not of that pliant class which is fertile in expedient and apology, but inquired for principles and fundamental law.

³ Prof. Diman's note is conclusive that Mr. Williams laid "no special emphasis on liberty of conscience" while in Massachusetts, but that, "like every great leader of opinion, he reached by degrees his own conclusion." Preface to Cotton's *Answer to R. Williams* in *Publications of the Narragansett Club*, ii, 58.

on the distinct provinces of civil and spiritual authority." "If," said Williams, "the Honorable Houses . . . shall erect a spirituall court for the judging of spiritual men, and spiritual causes (although a new name be put upon it, yet), whether or no such a court is not, in the true nature and kind of it, an High Commission." ¹

At the very same time Milton in his "*Arcopagitica; or, A Speech for the Liberty of Unlicensed Printing; addressed to the Parliament of England*," 1644, said, "If it come to inquisitioning again, and licensing, and that we are so timorous of ourselves and suspicious of all men, as to fear each book, and the shaking of each leaf, before we know what the contents are; if some [Presbyterians] who but of late were little better than silenced [by the bishops] from preaching, shall now come to silence us from reading, except what they please, it cannot be guessed what is intended by some, but a second tyranny over learning: and will soon put it out of controversy, that bishops and presbyters are the same to us, both name and thing." Williams and Milton were intimate, and this coincidence of thought and language is interesting.

When Sir Henry Vane secured the alliance of the Scots, in 1643, by the League and Covenant, he put in use the lesson learned in Mr. John Cotton's study, and insisted on the insertion of the words, "according to the Word of God," which was a reservation of freedom of conscience ² and opinion, fatal to Presbyterian pretension, but fully appreciated by them only at a later day and to their infinite disgust. For example: "It was not in our thoughts or intentions," Rutherford protested in 1648, — "your Independencies and separations, your Schismes, Atheistical and Epicurean tenets of toleration of all sects, religions, false ways, your Antinomians, Familists, Socinians, Arminians, Arrians, Antitrinitarians, Antiscripturarians, Seekers, Anabaptists; all of which I cannot but judge to bee yours, because you are so farre from writing against them." Poor Mr. Rutherford!

¹ In the *Publications of the Narragansett Club*, ii, 241-276.

² John Cook of *Gray's Inn Barrister*, in his tract *What the Independents would have*, 1647, says that "to be as free to choose their own company, place, and time, with whom, where and when to worship God . . . will satisfie all that go under the name of Independents." p. 2.

But the political pendulum backward swung ; and with beatifications of Charles the Martyr for religion, Nell Gwyn for morals, Rochester for letters, Jefferies and Scroggs for justice, unconditional obedience for the people and divine right for the king and his " creatures," " shop-keeping " ethics for Parliament, John Bunyan in jail, Russell and Algernon Sidney on the scaffold, Monarchy and Anglo-Catholicism supplanted the Commonwealth, at the cost of all that noble minds hold dear, and England went — on her way to the inevitable Revolution of 1689.

Though Mr. Godwin, the historian of the Commonwealth,¹ limits the sway of the Republican party to the period closing at the Restoration, and dated its final extinction at the Revolution of 1688, its spirit flourished with unabated vigor in the American colonies, successfully resisting the slavish fanaticism of loyalty which revoked the healthy legislation of the Commonwealth and defaced the statute-book with acts which disgraced the nation, and whose story is one of the darkest in cruelty and shame.

u No duty can be presented to the American historian more agreeable, more a theme for generous exaltation, than that of tracing and illustrating the irrepressible spirit of colonial independence,² from the day of the contemptuous turning of the Pilgrims from the English court without a royal protection, — typical of the whole political history of the country, — to the admission of the American ambassador at the same court in 1785.

And in the same pages England may read the story of the vindication of her own liberties, the freedom of her own constitution, — nay, more : it was Charles James Fox who, in the House of Commons, declared that " the resistance of the Americans to the oppression of the mother country has undoubtedly preserved the liberties of mankind."

In fifty years after the landing at Plymouth, England was in great trepidation about her colonies. Evelyn reports that

¹ Vol. i, p. 6.

² Mr. Walsh's *Appeal*, Sections i, ii, vi, — a work which should be republished with a supplementary volume on the same plan, on the relation of England to the United States in the late civil war, — *with an index*.

there were long debates in the royal council in 1670 and 1671, whether New England was "of such power, as to be able, to resist his Majesty, and declare for themselves as independent of the Crown, . . . appearing to be very independent as to their regard to Old England, or his Majesty, rich and strong as they now were . . . there was fear of their breaking from all dependence upon this nation," and it was deemed prudent not to send, for fear of resistance, "a few of his Majestie's first-class fregats" but a deputy with an open commission and — secret instructions.¹ In his journal of August, 1676, the worthy minister, Mr. Robert Law, says that New England "refused to own the King of Britain as their King; only in commemoration of their coming out of England, they now and then send him a free gift."²

By temperate life New England so increased, that in 1745, with "*Nil Desperandum, Christo Duce*" on her flag, she dealt a fatal blow to French dominion in America, and gave peace to Europe.³ But listen to Colonel Barre in the House of Commons, October 25, 1775: "To a mind that loves to contemplate the glorious spirit of freedom, no spectacle can be more affecting than the action at Bunker Hill . . . inspired by that genius of liberty which is the noblest emotion of the heart, which it is impossible to conquer, impracticable to dismiss. . . . Who can reflect on such scenes," he exclaimed, "and not adore the constitution of government which could breed such men?"

Sir Richard Sutton, in the same House, said, "If you ask an American who is his master, he will tell you he has none; nor any governor but Jesus Christ," and the Pilgrims of 1620 but echo back the sentiment.

We have endeavored to show the origin and the mission of the Mayflower. The feverish ages of ignorance, superstition, and bigotry, of intolerance and persecution, make up the sombre background for the Pilgrims, who, on the open Bible, hold out to us and to mankind their luminous scroll of constitutional liberty, November 21, 1620:

"They came not for themselves alone, they came for all mankind."

¹ *Diary*, 59-61, 68, Ed. 1854, ii, 59-61.

² Walsh's *Appeal*, 54, 75.

³ Dr. Usher Parsons' *Life of Pepperell*, 52, 145. *Universal History*, xxi, 157, 51.

The Pilgrim heritage is incorporated into the Constitution of the United States of America, in these words : "Article I. Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof ; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press ; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for redress of grievances."

Out of this all the rest comes as naturally as the flower from the calyx.

" And still their spirit, in their sons, with freedom walks abroad ;
The Bible is our only creed, our only sovereign, GOD !
The hand is raised, the word is spoke, the joyful pledge is given,
And boldly on our banner floats, in the free air of heaven,
The motto of our sainted sires ; and loud we 'll make it ring, —
A Church without a Bishop, and a State without a King ! "

The Pilgrim colony — the people living under their system of government — has become a great nation, and time, the test of truth, is giving in its verdict, abroad as well as at home, in official statistics as well as in the more delicate tokens, often

— " strong as proof from Holy Writ."

Among the historical panels in the House of Lords, one, devoted to "The Pilgrim Fathers Landing in New England," is, we venture to assert, in the light of this investigation, the most appropriate of any in the modern history of England herself.

Expressive of the same revolution in opinion and feeling was the graceful tribute to Mr. John Cotton, — two hundred and twenty-five years after his escape from hierarchal persecution, — in a memorial tablet of brass to his memory, fixed in "Cotton Chapel" in the old Boston Church, "in order that the name of an illustrious man, the love and honor of both worlds, might not any longer be banished from that noble temple." This was in 1857. It was the occasion for the new Bishop of Lincoln's first official act, and Laud's successor, the Bishop of London, joined in the homage.

Fitly and closely following this, Parliament ordered an

expurgated prayer-book, omitting the statutory worship of "Charles the Martyr," whose "royal blood" till then "cried to heaven every thirtieth of January for judgment, only to be averted by salt fish and egg sauce," and suppressing the annual fast, in which the Tyrant's¹ death was spoken of as a sort of deicide, and compared to the death of our Saviour. Submission and obedience, clear, absolute, and without exception, was the "badge" and character of the Church of England. "We can form no adequate conception," says Hallam, "of the jeopardy in which our liberties stood under the Stuarts . . . without attending to this spirit of servility."² After one hundred and ninety-nine years of this burlesque sacrament of political slavery, it was repealed, as it had been created, by Act of Parliament; and as if to emphasize the removal of this stigma from the ecclesiastical calendar, by the same authority Cromwell is raised to his own historical niche, and fact triumphs over fiction, truth over falsehood.

We have not space to allude to the social and material results, the religious, moral, and æsthetic, the origin or rapid development of which the philosophic historian will trace to the influences growing out of the event we celebrate; but enough has been told of the men of 1620, their doctrines and work, to show that

"We have need of these
Clear beacon stars, to warn and guide our age;
The great traditions of a nation's life,
Her children's lustrous deeds, with honor rife,
Are her most precious jewels, noblest heritage,
Time-polisht jewels in her diadem."

¹ John Bradshaw (a name which will be repeated with applause wherever liberty is cherished or is known) was sprung from a noble family. To a profound knowledge of the law, he added the most comprehensive views, the most generous sentiments, manners the most obliging and the most pure. And his glory is much exalted above that of all other tyrannicides, as it is both more humane, more just, and more strikingly grand, judicially to condemn a tyrant, than to put him to death without a trial." Milton's *The Second Defence of the People of England*.

² Macaulay's *Rev. of Hallam's Const. Hist. of Eng.* Jonathan Mayhew's *Discourse on Charles First's Death*, in *Pulpit of Am. Revolution*.



